COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XI. No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1807. [PRICE 10D

" I contend, that there is enough before the House to induce them to inquire, and, the honorable gentle-
" men on the other side, unless they felt something against them would come out in that inquiry, would
" be amongst the first to propose, and the last to shrink from, a committee."—— MR. GREY's Speech in the House of Commons, 13th March, 1792, upon a motion for an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Rose respecting the Westminster Election.

" To take up the time of the House upon these unfounded inquiries, would only impede the progress of
" public business, and derogate from the dignity, which belongs to the deliberative character of the House."
——MR. PITT's Speech in the same debate.

CORRECTION.——An error of the press, in my last, page 236, makes me say, that the company, at Sir Francis Burdett's Dinner, " *seemed* to be guilty of hypocrisy." It should have been, as the context will shew, " *scorned* to be guilty of hypocrisy."

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT. (Continued from page 231.)—I. *Sinecure Places and Pensions.* II. *Foreigner's Property in the Funds.* III. *Hampshire Petition.*

.——I. Respecting SINECURE PLACES AND PENSIONS Mr. Biddulph made a motion on the 10th instant, for the " ap-
" pointment of a *committee* to inquire
" *whether any*, and what *further* saving
" may be made by the abolition of useless
" and sinecure offices, by the reduction of
" exorbitant fees, and by other modes of
" retrenchment in the expenditure of the
" public money."——When notice of this motion was given, I flattered myself, that, upon the principles whereon Mr. Biddulph had acted in the case of the Chairman of Ways and Means, he would have come at once with a motion for the abolition of certain enormous sinecures and pensions, and that he would have included the additions made last year to the pensions to the Royal Family. To appoint a committee to *inquire*, and to inquire, too, *whether any* saving *could* be made, and whether any *further* saving, too; this was, it seems to me, exactly what the people of Whitehall could have wished for. There have been such committees before, and still the amount of the grants has gone on *increasing*. There has never been any diminution of the annual amount of sinecure places and pensions, since the day that Pitt took possession of the government. But, this motion of Mr. Biddulph, instead of at once putting the ministers to the proof; instead of shewing the country what it had to expect from them in the way of economy; instead of doing this by a proposition for abolishing such sinecures and pensions as never were merited by the parties enjoying them; instead of this, the motion was calculated, like the " Learned Languages," to produce an effect *worse than useless*; because, by the appointment of a committee, no reduction at all will be brought about, and because, by such appointment, some persons will be led to believe that a reduction will be brought about, and, moreover, because, by the wording of the motion, a doubt seems to exist in the mind even of the mover, whether any saving at all *can be made* in this way, while he admits, contrary to the fact, that *savings have actually taken place* in consequence of the inquiries of such committees.——Well might the ministers agree to the motion, as they did, with a small modification of it by Lord Henry Petty. But, there are some passages in the speeches, as reported in the newspapers, that I must notice. Lord Henry Petty began by professions of a love of economy, in the usual style of Pitt. He next asserted, upon what authority I know not, that, for the last *twenty years*, great care had been taken by his Majesty's ministers to abolish, as fast as possible, all useless allowances out of the public money. His Lordship did, indeed, quite forget to state, that the increase in this way had been *ten times as great* as the diminution. This trifling omission, however, was nothing in comparison with the argument made use of by this minister, that the sinecures, however great and however conferred, ought not to be abolished, because they were " connected with the *his-*
" *tory* of the country and with the several
" branches of the *constitution*, from its
" origin." Indeed! What, is the Tellership of the Exchequer, the Auditorship of the Exchequer, the Collectorship of the Customs outwards, the Collectorship of the Customs inwards, the Registarship of the Admiralty court; are these so essentially

connected with the history and constitution of the country as to be necessary to the existence of the latter? Really, this way of talking about the constitution, "our in- "valuable constitution," may, I am afraid, give a handle to Jacobins and Levellers, and may lead some weak persons to think, that, when they are, in such pathetic accounts, called upon to shed the last drop of their blood for the preserving of our "happy "constitution," the persons so calling upon them do not leave places and pensions out of their estimation; and, in short, that to fight for the constitution is, in fact, to fight for the honour of paying an enormous sum annually to persons who render no services for it. But, seriously speaking, does Lord Henry Petty really believe, that, if the sinecures of the Marquis of Buckingham, Lord Arden (with the reversion to Mr. Perceval), Lord Liverpool, the Duke of Manchester, Lord Hobart, Lord Sidmouth's son, Lord Auckland's son, Lord Grenville, Mr. Thomas Grenville, Lord Hawkesbury, and many, many others; does he really believe, that, if these titled persons, these persons bearing coronets upon their coaches, were to cease to receive immense sums out of the public money, out of the fruit of the people's labour, under the character of clerks and custom-house officers, that the aristocratical part of the constitution would thereby *receive a wound?* Does he, in good earnest, believe, that the aristocracy is rendered *more respectable* by an Earl's being collector of the customs inwards, and by a Duke's being collector of the customs outwards; by one Lord's being a clerk of the pleas and another a clerk in the admiralty court?——His Lordship was very careful to express, in the clearest manner, his conviction, that no power upon earth had a right to trench upon, or to touch, the grants already made and enjoyed. This is a doctrine truly comfortable to us. No matter how hard we are pressed. No matter how burdened. There is no relief in this way; while, at the same time, there is nothing to set bounds as to the making of new grants; nothing but the mere mercy of the king and his ministers. And here, as in many other cases, we may observe, that, as to the laws made in *favour* of the liberty and property of the people, they can be, at any time, changed, as the circumstances of the times, or the will of our rulers, may dictate; but, on the other side, our laws, like those of the Medes and Persians, are immutable. The late Mr. Fox, of whom I always wish to think as well as I can, and who was a very great man in many respects, held the same opinion as that now declared by Lord Henry Petty. His argument, used on the 8th of April, 1794, was, that "you "should never suffer yourself to trench up- "on *private property* in any degree. If a "pension or sinecure was unworthily be- "stowed by a minister, he would make "complaint against that minister. But, if "it was bestowed *legally*, it became a part "of the person's property, on whom it was "conferred, and, like all other property, "was sacred. All that he wished, in any "case, to ask about property, was, whether "it was legally granted by a person com- "petent to grant it, and whether it had "been received by a person competent to "receive it. He should, therefore, be for "holding sacred from the operation of the "proposed measure, all sinecures and pen- "sions held for a term of years, or for life." That this reasoning was heartily cheered and adopted by Pitt the reader will have anticipated; but, he will not, I hope, have concluded, that it was, on that account, the more sound.——It was the reasoning of a mere barrister; and that, too, of a barrister of a mind the most superficial. There are many grants of property really private, which grants, though strictly *legal*, are set aside in a court of *equity*; and, indeed, there are very few grants of private property not liable to such controul. But, to insist that it is unjust for acts of parliament to touch private property, is to be bold indeed, when, every day of our lives, we see the houses and lands of private persons taken from them by acts of parliament, and paid for, when paid for at all, agreeably to a scale in the forming of which the proprietor has no act or part. This, I shall be told, is for the general good; and, it is because it would be for the general good, that I would recommend an abolition of unmerited grants of the public money. The profits, however, of sinecures and pensions are not private property. They are paid out of the annual fruit of the people's labour; and, if there be not, out of that source a sufficiency of money to pay the annuities, they cannot be paid; yet, would you, in such a case assert, that there was a violation of private property? The argument of Mr. Fox stops at nothing. It would admit of a minister's granting away in pensions for life, and in reversion too, of the whole of the nation's revenues, and it would, even in such case, only allow you to "*complain* "against such minister;" but, you must not stop the payment of the pensions; no, nor must you cut off the burdensome entail. You may freely pass acts of parliament for pulling down people's houses that the members may have a view of Westminster Abbey

Church, as they ride to and fro to St. Stephen's, paying the owners agreeably to a scale formed by yourselves; but, though the number of paupers be tripled, and though the enemy be at your gates, you must go on fully to discharge the annual demand made upon you by the endless list of pensioners, into whose original claim upon the public you are not suffered to inquire! That such an argument should have been made use of by Mr. Fox does, at first sight, seem surprising; but, alas! *Mr. Fox was both a sinecure placeman and a pensioner from his infancy to the day of his death.* Thus it is, that patriotism is cramped. If Mr. Fox had set the Club-houses at defiance. If he had brought his mind to an humble appearance in life; to be content with what nature and decency require; what mighty things would he have effected, and, at the same time, what serenity of mind, what real pleasure would he have enjoyed! Then might he have disregarded the majority of the minister, and the folly of the populace. Many, many years ago, would he have been called, by the unanimous voice of the nation, to conduct its affairs. Bot, the love of tumultuous scenes and pleasures led him into expences that rendered him dependent on one or another, 'till, at last, this state of existence became habitual to him; and he finally left the world without having accomplished any one thing serviceable to his country.——In the debate, upon which we are commenting, Mr. Wilberforce made an observation, and, indeed, an assertion, that must not pass unnoticed. He took occasion to introduce the name of his beloved friend, Mr. Pitt, and asserted, that he had abolished several sinecure places. The fact, he said, was not generally known; but he could bear testimony to the truth of it, which was the more necessary, because that great man "did good by stealth, and blushed to find "it fame."—What were the particular sinecure places, which were abolished by the "*great* man," during whose absolute sway over us England gave up the Lillies and the honour of the Flag, and France became mistress of Europe, the member for Yorkshire did not say; nor did he think it necessary to state, that, while this work of abolishing was going on, the amount of the Civil List was annually increasing at such a rate, that, at the end of his administration and his life, the total of that and of the secret service money was twice as much as it was when his administration began. This fact the pious member forgot, doubtless, to state. But, as to the doing good by *stealth*, I think, we have a tolerably good proof of that, in the instance of the "*great* man's" lending to Boyd and Benfield, two members of parliament, at that time composing part of his majority, forty thousand pounds of the public money, without interest, and that, too, without communicating the matter even to his colleagues of the cabinet, and without making, or causing to be made, any record or minute of the transaction. This was, indeed, "doing good by *stealth*;" but, when he "found it fame," though he might, and, undoubtedly was, much mortified at it, I never heard, that he actually "*blushed*;" nor do I believe, that any man living ever saw him blush upon any occasion: and, what is more, Mr. Wilberforce, I am strongly inclined to think, that blushing is not very common amongst those who were his supporters while living, and who are his eulogists now that he is dead. During his terrible reign there was more of the public wealth squandered away, than ever was squandered away in England from the accession of the Stuarts to the year 1784. During the very last year of his destructive power, he laid on pensions which added nearly a million to the public debt. No 200 years of our history afford instances of so much of profligate expenditure as are afforded by his 20 years administration; and, all the while he was, year after year, imposing taxes such as the people of England had never before heard of, such as their forefathers never would have submitted to, and such as they would not have submitted to, had they not been, little by little, inveigled into the submission by the crafty use of a settled system of alarm.——To return for a moment to the motion of Mr. Biddulph, my opinion is, that it will do no good; that it will produce a milk-and-water report that very few persons will ever read, and that it will cost the country about 500l. in printing; and that, after the subject has thus been laid at rest for a whole year, or more, not a single place or pension will be abolished.——II. FOREIGN PROPERTY in the funds is, as the reader will recollect, exempted from the Income Tax. Upon what principle this exemption was founded will be seen by a reference to the debates upon the bill, during the last session of parliament, and also by a reference to Vol. 9 of the Register, under the words *Income Tax*. Mr. Bankes has now made a motion for an account to be laid before parliament of the amount of this property; and, if the true account can be come at, the amount will appear to be very considerable. But it seems rather odd to me, that Mr. Bankes should not have included in his motion the amount of the

king's property in the funds, which, by the same act of parliament, is exempted from the tax. Upon what *principle* this exemption was made I, for my part, never could even guess at. No light, upon the subject could be derived from the proceedings in the senate; for there, no one of the "faithful commons" ever asked a question respecting it. Now, it seems to me, that, in the first place, the *amount* of this property should be known, in order that the people who pay taxes to support the royal family may know how far it is reasonable, that new grants should be, as in the case of last year, made out of the taxes for the support of that family; for, if the king should appear to have much money in the funds, the necessity of such new grants must, of course, be less evident. And, though the "faithful "commons" were, to a man, silent as mutes upon the subject, I must confess, that, while I see my annual earnings, out of which I am endeavouring to save some little matter for my children, and which endeavours must cease with my life and even with my health; while I see these earnings, in common with those of every tradesman, farmer, parson, lawyer, or physician, greatly deducted from for the purpose of supporting the state, I am not content to see the property of the king exempted from taxation; for, without inquiry *whence* that property came, I know right well, that it is for the defence of it as much, *at least*, as of my property, that public sacrifices are called for, and that the war is carried on. Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Whitbread will, perhaps, call me Jacobin and Leveller for having made this declaration, but, one of those gentlemen lives upon the public money, and the other seems very willing to do so. They, therefore, may think it very reasonable to call upon the people to sacrifice "even the necessaries of life," rather than suffer the foe to invade us, while they justify the exemption of the king's property from its due share of taxation; but, if a man, who, from the effect of unwearied industry and rigid economy is able to lay by a hundred or two a year, sees a tenth part of it taken away by the tax-gatherer, while the king's property contributes nothing at all; if such a man complain, and in the bitterness of his heart, call them base apostates; if, boiling with a sense of the injustice and lacking all means of redress, he brand them and the like of them with appellations due to their conduct, though they may accuse him of revolutionary designs, the virtuous part of the nation will not, but, while they sympathize in his feelings will applaud his public spirit.——Am I told, that, as the king is supported by the public, it would be useless to tax his property, because whatever is taken away in tax must be made up to him in new grants? My answer is, that the property of which we are speaking is *private property*; and that, without any such resource, the king receives a most ample allowance annually for every purpose, and, moreover, that this allowance is, from time to time, when it is alleged to have been insufficient, augmented by special parliamentary grants; so that, upon this ground, there is not a shadow of pretext remaining. But, supposing this not to be the case. Supposing the king's to be a fixed income, not occasionally augmented. And, then, how will the general practice bear out the argument? The king's allowance is paid by the public, and so is the pay of every officer of the army and the navy, and so is the salary of every clerk in the several offices; and yet their pay and salaries are taxed. All of them pay a full *tenth* back again to the public; and why should not the king? Mr. Sheridan and John Bowles, with their associates, Mr. Perry and Redhead Yorke, may call Jacobin and Leveller 'till they are hoarse; but, of this I will complain as long as I have the means of communicating my sentiments to the public.——III. THE HAMPSHIRE PETITION was brought forward for discussion on the 13th instant. Mr. Asheton Smith, the member who presented the petition, opened the debate in a very appropriate speech, at the conclusion of which he moved for a reference of the petition to the committee of privileges, to examine the matter thereof, and to report the same, together with their opinion thereon to the House.——The motion was seconded by Sir Henry Mildmay, who, in a speech remarkable for cleaness as well as manliness, and perfectly characteristic of a good cause, first described the peculiar situation of the county of Southampton, and shewed, that, if the ministry were suffered to interfere in its elections, there could not possibly be any more freedom in that county, than in any rotten borough in the kingdom. He then, in order to substantiate the allegations in the petition proceeded thus, as is stated in the report of the debate given in the Morning Chronicle. "In or-"der to come nearer to the subject, he "should beg leave to read the documents "upon which this proceeding rested; and "first, the paper, which was the founda-"tion of the whole business—(Here the "hon. baronet read an extract from the "first letter of Sir Wm. Heathcote to the

" Hampshire Club, stating the application " of Lord Temple, authorised by Lord " Grenville, to himself, intimating to him, " that government would not oppose his re- " election, in the event of a dissolution, " if he did not coalesce with Mr. Chute, " against whom government proposed to set " up a cndidate, Mr. Chute having put " himself in systematic opposition to go- " vernment.) By this it would appear, " that the interference of the executive to " that county had not originated with the " Secretary to the Treasury, nor with the " Comptroller of the Navy, but was a pre- " conceated, premeditated, and predigest- " ed plan of the government, to dictate " representatives to the county of South- " ampton, and to exclnde a respectable " gentleman who had represented that coun- " ty for 16 years. It was, however, in " candour, necessary for him to state, that " the noble lord had given a subsequent ex- " planation of that transaction, and with- " out at all imputing any wilful misrepre- " sentation to either of these persons, there " appeared to him a contradiction in their " statements. It would be for the House " to decide which was most likely to be " correct, Sir Wm. Heathcote, who re- " tired to his closet after the snterview to " make a memorandum of what passed, " with a view to its publication, or the " noble lord, who, without the aid of any " memorandum whatever, 3 weeks after, " gave an explanation of it. The next let- " ter he had to notice was one dated Sept. " 22, from Wm. Freemantle, Esq. one of " the Secretaries of the Treasury, to the " Barrack Master General. This letter had " been sent by the Barrack Master Gene- " ral, General Hewitt, inclosed in one " from himself to Major Davies, Deputy " Barrack Master General. General Hewitt, " in his letter, stated that he could not bet- " ter carry into effect the recommendation " of Mr. Freemantle, than by inclosing " his letter to Major Davies. (The hon. " baronet here read the letter from the Se- " cretary to the Treasury to the Barrack " Master General, recommending the go- " vernment candidates, the hon. Mr. Her- " bert and Mr. Thistlethwaite, to his fa- " vourable influence, and requesting of " him to mention the same to the other " gentlemen of the department.) This " letter had been marked " on *his Majes-* " *ty's service,*" and the copy which he " had of it had been taken from the letter " which had been in the possession of Ma- " jor Davies. In consequence of it, every " exertion had been made, and with suc- " cess. To this Major Davies had applied, " that the committee were of opinion that " his canvass woulc be more effectual at " Limington and the Isle of Wight. The " next letter was from General Hewitt, to " Major Davies, informing him that he " might go to Limington if he could obtain " the permission of the commander of the " distuict, but at the same time that he " could not be allowed any thing to defray " the expenses of his journey, this being " *a species of service* which could not be in- " serted in the public accounts. The im- " pression on his mind from this letter was, " that there were two accounts kept in the " barrack department, one public and the " other private. At any rate this showed " more than any thing else the necessity of " going into the committee, in order to as- " certain whether or not there was any pri- " vate account. The next letter was from " Major Davies to the Barrack Master Ge- " neral, stating that his destination had " been fixed for Limington and the Isle of " Wight, and that *his route had been sketch-* " *ed by Lord Carnarvon,* to that point, as " not very far from the residence of Mr. " Rose. The next letter he had to notice, " was one in Major Davies stated, that the " Duke of Cumberland would not suffer " him to depart for Limington, till he should " himself set out for Wales which he im- " puted to a fear, on the part of his Royal " Highness, lest his efforts should produce " an effect inimical to his political connec- " tions. The last letter which he had to " notice, was one dated Jan. 1, 1806, " which ought evidently to be 1807, in " which it was stated, that Major Davies " was prosecuted by Mr. Daverell, on the " opposite side, and that he had an offer " made to him by Col. St. John, on the " part of one of the most respectable men " in the county, of relieving him from all " his embarrassments, if he should give up " the Treasury letters in his possession, " which preposal he had rejected. He was " as curious as any man, to find out who " this most respectable man of the county " was, and though he had been forty years " resident in Hampshire, if he were asked " to point such a person out, he should find " that difficult. However, as this person " who could so bully and bribe with the " same breath—who was so ready to dis- " charge Major Davies from his embarrass- " ments, might also have the means of in- " juring him, he was bound to state that he " had obtained copies of the letters from a " person who had them in his possession, " previous to the election. From this writ-

" ten evidence they could shew, that the " government had issued its mandates to " the Barrack Department, and that its di- " rections had been faithfully executed. " The same course had been adopted in all " the other departments, and particularly by " the Comptroller of the Navy. If they " could prove the fact in one instance, that " would be sufficient to prove their case." ——This *Major Davies*, it will be observed, is the same identical Major Davies, upon whose report, in the Isle of Wight, poor Atkins, the Barrack-master, was dismissed, and whom the Spartan General spoke of, in the debates upon Mr. Robson's motion, as a person of " great respectability," whose character was not to be trifled with. This should have been borne in mind by the ministers, when they were speaking of him in the present debate. But, as to this man's having been *prosecuted* by Mr. Deverell, or threatened to be prosecuted by him, for the purpose of intimidation, the fact, I have good reason to believe, is totally false. The truth is, that I have taken some pains to ascertain this fact, and I take upon me to assert, that the proceeding against Major Davies, wherein Mr. Deverell acted professionally, would have taken place, and must have taken place, if there had been no election contest going forward. Mr. Deverell, it is well known, has long been a zealous and not inefficient opposer of the party of Mr. Rose. He has long felt, like every Hampshire man of an independent mind, impatient under the absolute sway of a person, who had no other pretension to power in the county, than that it had pleased the arrogant Pitt, who took delight in insulting the people, to throw this county under his feet. If a man has it in his power to proceed against another legally, it is quite natural that his disposition so to do should be quickened by what he may deem the party hostility of that other, and especially when that hostility may probably prevent what he considers as a deliverance from disgraceful thraldom. But, the fact is, that Mr. Deverell did not proceed against Major Davies with that rigor which he might have proceeded with, and with which his client had directed him to proceed upon the very day, I believe, when he spoke to Major Davies the words, which, in order to raise himself in the estimation of his party, he interpreted into a political threat; and this motive seems to have led to the invention of the story about the offer of Colonel St. John, which, from every thing I have been able to learn of the matter, is a pure fiction.——But, as to *the letter of Mr. Freemantle*, that admits of no mitigation. Before, however, we proceed to make any further remarks upon it, let us hear the defence of this gentleman, who began his speech by bespeaking the indulgence of the House, this being the first time that he had ever spoken in that assembly; and, it was, indeed, singularly unfortunate, that, in a *maiden* speech, one of our " faithful commons " should have to defend himself against a charge, unequivocally preferred, of having endeavoured to undermine the rights of the people! After having complained of a want of *candour* in his accusers, he proceeded to the main point thus: "The " letter was dated Treasury Chambers, Sep. " 22, some time previous to the dissolution, " and was marked " private." He should " not say that many letters on official bu- " siness might not be sometimes marked in " this manner, but certainly the gentlemen " opposite, who had so much more ex- " perience in the business of office than he " had, must know, that letters so marked " were never preserved by official copies in " the office. He only *recommended* the " candidates whom he wished to succeed, " to the favorable influence of the Barrack- " master-general, and requested of him to " recommend them to the other gentlemen " in that department. These were the ex- " pressions he made use of, and he was " ready both to claim and to justify them. " Now as to the charge, " that W. Free- " mantle, Esq., one of the secretaries, who " had no property in the county, had em- " ployed the power of his office to influence " the election," he could easily dispose of " that. It was one of the unfortunate con- " sequences of the petition having been " brought forward without any communi- " cation being made to him on the subject, " that such a statement as that had found its " way into the petition. If the hon. mem- " bers who brought forward the petition, " had informed him of its contents, he " could have saved them the trouble of " presenting it at all—he would have saved " them the disgrace they must feel from " the indignation of the house, or he would " have saved the house the power of listen- " ing to his jusfification. The answer that " he had to make to that charge was, that " he was a freeholder of the county of " Southampton, that he had a property in " that county, and that he had as good a " right as any of the gentlemen who had " thought proper to sign the petition, to " employ all the means which his property, " influence, or connections afforded, to pro- " mote the election of those candidates " whom he wished to succeed. He had

" for many years possessed a property in " that county, and *his nearest and dearest* " *connections* lived there, who were in the " habit of consulting him, and who would " be influenced by his advice, had proper- " ties in that county, equal to any, and " larger than the properties of most of those " whose names were to the petition. " Though he had been settled at the Trea- " sury, it did not follow that he was to be " denied that which was *the birthright of* " *every Englishman*, the right of giving his " support and influence to the candidate " whom he preferred. If he were to be " deprived of that right by his office, he " would not hold the office five minutes. " So far he had considered the question on " the ground of private feelings. He should " next ask the hon. baronet, by what law " it was that he was deprived of this right, " merely because he held the situation of " secretary to the treasury? The resolution " of the house in 1779, extended only to " persons who should use the power *of* " *their official situations* to influence elec- " tions, but did not preclude persons hold- " ing offices from giving their votes *and* " *interest to whatever candidate they pleased.* " He was not aware of any law to that " effect, and he begged the house to look " at the situation it would be in, was every " member of the government of this coun- " try, whatever might be their talents, their " wealth, or their consequence, deprived " of using his influence with those " with whom he was acquainted. He had " known General Hewitt, and had under- " stood that Major Davies was a freeholder, " in the county of Southampton, and had " applied to General Hewitt for the purpose " of obtaining that vote. Whether he had " been rightly informed as to Major Da- " vies having a vote, he could not tell, but " he had reason to believe that he had not " voted either for Mr. Herbert or Mr. This- " tlethwaite."——It having been asserted by Mr. Freemantle, in the latter part of his speech, that the ministry had used no undue influence, during the late election, Mr. Jeffery, member for Poole, stated very glaring instances of this influence at Poole. It was, he said, publickly acknowledged, that the *patronage* of government was given to his opponent. Places, which had been actually promised to some persons, were refused after qualifications were given, and were given to others, who had taken the side of his opponent.——Mr. Biddulph insisted that an inquiry was necessary to the support of the character of the House.——Mr. Jenkinson, member for Dover, said that the interference of government was so undisguised in that borough, that some of the voters told him, that they had received *an order* from the Ordnance and Victualling Boards to give both their votes for his opponent, under pain of losing their situations. ——Mr. Tierney treated the petition with the utmost contempt; he saw *nothing at all improper* in the conduct of Mr. Freemantle, and saw no end that the going into a committee could possibly answer, except that of *interrupting public business* and *lowering the dignity of* the House.——Mr. Canning congratulated the ministers on the path they were taking to fulfil their old pledges about parliamentary reform; but, he took special care not to pass, even by implication, any censure upon the Grenville part of the ministry, and, of course, though he said he should vote for the reference to a committee, he seemed to see very little that was wrong in the conduct of Mr. Freemantle, whom he most highly complimented.——Mr. Adam objected to the reference upon the ground that the charge was not of a nature sufficiently grave.——Lord Folkestone allowed that the members of government had a right to interfere in elections as private individuals; but he could consider the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Barrack Master General, in this case, only as an official letter. It was understood as such by those whose conduct it was to influence. He was surprized that the gentlemen on the other side would not assent to the motion, in consideration of their own honour, of the honour of the county of Hants, and of the House of Commons. He understood that much further grounds of crimination were to be brought forward; and particularly a letter from one of the other Public Boards, signed by the Secretary. On this ground, he wished to go into the committee. —— Mr. George Johnstone, who has himself, I believe, some little *practical* knowledge of elections, said that he had seen a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to an elector in Yorkshire to influence his vote. This gentleman conjured the House not to reject the motion, lest the people should begin to think, that, in good earnest, the elective franchise was become a mere farce.——Mr. Bragge did not think there were sufficient grounds for sending the petition to a committee.——Mr. Perceval began an admirable speech by observing, " that he had " heard in the course of the debate a gene- " ral expression of surprise——one set of " gentlemen were surprised at the manner " in which this charge had been brought " forward—— another at the charge itself. " A noble lord who had just sat down

" (Lord Folkestone) had freely expressed " his surprise at the strange reception this " petition had met with from his Majesty's " ministers in that House; and the noble " lord was surprised at such a reception, " because the noble lord thought such a line " of conduct inconsistent with those profes- " sions in favour of free and liberal inquiry " into alledged abuses of a public nature, " which were ever in the mouths of the men " comprising the present government of the " country. He, for his part, could not be " brought to think that the reason assigned " was at all a satisfactory one, for to be told " that the present administration were in " every instance acting in direct inconsis- " tency with their professions when out of " power, would have produced in his mind " sensations very opposite to those of sur- " prise. No; of all other emotions, sur- " prise was that from which he was at that " moment most free. What had been the " conduct of ministers upon that night, he " had long since learned to anticipate from " what had been their conduct upon all oc- " casions that involved the sincerity of their " former professions in the bold and un- " blushing contradiction of their practice " He therefore was prepared to receive that " fresh instance of their good faith and con- " sistency, as completely of a piece with " all their other proceedings; for, however " they might, night after night, uniformly " pursue that conduct which when out of " office they as uniformly decried, they " had been since they came into office, at " least, consistent in their systematic perse- " verance, in contradicting both in their " language and in their measures, all the " mighty professions and high-flying theo- " ries which in so great a measure characte- " rised that deceased body of reformers." ——After having animadverted upon their barefaced inconsistency, in having, upon a former night professed to pant for the moment of investigation and now getting rid of all investigation by the vote of a majority, he thus concluded a speech, which would not have disgraced Sir Francis Burdett himself: " If the House reject this petition, " notwithstanding the strong grounds upon " which it is supported, what will be the " consequence? What a proud precedent " shall ministers have to boast of in this " precious sample of their Treasury corres- " pondence——then may they fix a Treasu- " rer in every county, in every town, in " every borough, then may each mem- " ber circulate through his respective bar- " rack department, *the decree of the govern- " ment against the subject's birthright*; " provided only that they keep within the " cautious limits of their precious precedent; " provided only they do not pronounce ac- " tual menace; provided only they do not " convey, through the medium of an *inno- " cent* freeholder's letter, a bribe taken from " the public money; provided they keep " within such limits, they are safe—the " precedent of this night will bear them " out, *and they will again find a House of " Commons who will countenance them in " their breach of that House's privileges, and " in the violation of the subject's constitutional " rights*, provided only that in the act of such " breach and violation, the forms of dis- " creetness and decorum prescribed in the " present precedent, be observed. I ear- " nestly advise the Ministers to depart from " this line of conduct which no talents can " ultimately rescue *from the indignant ani- " madversion of the country*—friends may " be for a time partial, and talents for a " time popular, but *rectitude of intention, " integrity of principle, and consistency of " conduct*, are the best, perhaps the only " means of permanently securing that pow- " er, which I hope they will endeavour to " maintain by better means than those by " which they have succeeded in acquiring " it."——Well, Mr. Perceval, the motion *was* rejected; the precedent *was* establish- ed; and will you suffer your John Bowles to call me Jacobin and Leveller, if I now, in your own true words, insist, that the government has passed " a decree against the sub- " jects' birthright?" Will you *now* recommend " *extraordinary exertions of the law*" against us, and " an enlargement of the ex- " ecutive power?" I shall presently shew, Sir, that the line of conduct in ministers, so justly reprobated by you now, was pnrsued by Pitt and his supporters, and I shall also shew, that those who are now in power took precisely the part, which you have now taken. But, first, we must hear my Lord Howick, who began by declaring that " there never had been a single instance of " such an individual and *personal opposition* " brought as the present. And would the " hon. and learned gentleman say, that dur- " ing the last 20 years there was no interfe- " rence in elections by former govern- " ments? *He did not mean to justify him- " self, or those connected with him, merely " by a declaration that others did the like*; " but it was fit that the attention of the " house should be called to the quarter " from which these complaints proceeded. " The noble lord next appealed to a letter " written by the right hon. gent. (Mr. " Rose), to a Contractor for the Ordnance,

" requesting him to exert his best offices " with his friends at Canterbury, in favour " of a candidate *(Mr. Calcraft)*, whose " election he was studious to promote. The " noble lord read the letter, which stated in " general the anxious wishes of the right " hon. gent. to secure the election of the " candidate he favoured, and pointed out " the means by which his object could be " best promoted. Was the right hon. gent. " a freeman of Canterbury, or was the in- " terence now complained of, in any mea- " sure to be compared with that which the " right hon. gent. had exerted in the Can- " terbury Election? Surely not. If then, " such a conduct *did not then call for the* " *censure of the House* (he did not mean to " contend that one abuse justified another), " with what face could the right hon. gent. " and his friends move to refer the present " case to a committee, which so much less " called for any such interference of the " House? But there were other instances " of the interference in elections by the " right hon. gent., far more glaring and un- " equivocal. He would content himself " with adverting to two; one occurred " during the Westminster Election, when " Lord Hood was the government candi- " date. Did it not appear from the exami- " nation of the expences attending that " election, that two separate accounts were " kept, one for lord Hood, *the other for the* " *Treasury?* Was not that a more fit sub- " ject than the present for the interference " and animadversion of the House? But " another case had occurred. Had not an " application been made (whether effectu- " ally or not he could not now state) to the " right hon. gent. to obtain the remission of " certain penalties under the Excise laws, " in favour of a person whose vote was to " be secured? On that occasion the charge " at least was made, and proof offered. " Whether the charge was true or false, it " was not for him to state; but in 1788 he " made a motion, the words of which the " noble lord repeated, for an enquiry into " the charge—a charge most grievous in all " its circumstances; *yet the motion for that* " *Committee of Inquiry was negatived.* " Should he refuse an inquiry under similar " circumstances, what would be the opinion " and the language of the gentlemen oppo- " site him? Yet they make out nothing " like such a case at present.—What is the " question now? Why, that Mr. Freeman- " tle, *of his own accord*, and *from the im-* " *pulse of private friendship* and affection " for a relation, addressed a letter to Gene- " ral Hewitt, requesting his friendly ser- " vices in favour of the candidate in whose " cause he so naturally interested himself." ——His lordship concluded his speech with a general assertion of the purity of his Majesty's ministers, and cited, as a proof of their readiness to admit of investigation, their assent to the motion of Mr. Biddulph, which motion, as I have, I think, above shewn, even Pitt himself would gladly have seconded as a step likely to keep up his system.——Mr. Rose said, in his vindication, " that the letter quoted he wrote merely to " a person who offered his services, and in " favour of an hon. member of that house, " (Mr. Calcraft) who certainly had not " made a very grateful return for the favour. " As to the other charge, of his having pro- " cured a prosecution for excise to be sus- " pended against an elector of Westminster " for his services upon the election for lord " Hood, he utterly denied the fact, and " called to the recollection of gentlemen, " that this subject was brought before that " house, on a motion for inquiry in 1798, " *but negatived by a very large majority,* " *on the principle, that there was no ground* " *laid for going into the inquiry.* This accu- " sation being repeated in a newspaper, he " brought a civil action against the printer, " thus giving him an opportunity to sub- " stantiate his charge if he could; but *upon* " *failing to do so, a verdict was found and* " *damages awarded against him. How* " *then could any imputation upon his cha-* " *racter be inferred from that proceeding?* " He was glad of the opportunity of mak- " ing this statement; as the pamphlet in " which the libel appeared, which was thus " punished, had been recently republished, " and brought to the printer, by whom it " was so republished, by a near connection " of a noble marquis, the father of the noble " lord (Temple). He stated instances of " ministerial influence in various elections " in Hampshire. In Christchurch an hon. " member (Mr. Calcraft) told four magis- " trates immediately previous to the last dis- " solution, that *if they would vote for the* " *Mayor, recommended by him* (Mr. Rose) " *they would be deprived of the offices they* " *held under Government*; and at the last " election there were *letters from Mr.* " *Freemantle, to several Custom-house and* " *Excise Officers, desiring their influence in* " *favour of two candidates*, who really were " never before known in the town. Thus " were those, who were by law forbidden, " under severe penalties, from at all inter- " fering with elections, exhorted to aid the " cause of two ministerial candidates. But " this was not all—an old military officer

" was written to, who really had no know-
" ledge whatever of this Mr. Freemantle;
" who, the man said to him (Mr. R.) when
" he shewed him the letter, signed with the
" seal of office, and dated Treasury Cham-
" bers —At Southampton, a Gentleman
" who held an office of £600 a year, which
" he owed to his own recommendation,
" wrote to him previous to the last election,
" to say that he would vote for his son at
" the last election if he dare, *but that if he*
" *did he should be deprived of his place.*
" *Many still stronger instances of abused*
" *power to destroy the freedom of election* he
" had it in his power to produce, if the
" House would go into the Committee of
" Privileges."——Mr. Calcraft denied the charge of ingratitude, and said, that the letter, written by Mr. Rose to Canterbury, *was not brought to light by him*, but by the person, to whom it was written.——After a few words from the Solicitor General, a division took place upon the motion of Mr. Asheton Smith, which was negatived; there being 57 for it, and 184 against it.——In remarking upon this proceeding, a proceeding of the very first magnitude, I shall begin with expressing my satisfaction at the conduct of Mr. Asheton Smith and that of Sir Henry Mildmay. The former has done the country great service in promoting the petition, the latter in supporting it in so able and manly a manner; and both of them great honour to themselves in having acted in a way which showed that they were regardless of what exposures it might lead to on either side. They acted as if they had said to the former and the present invaders of the rights of election: " answer for yourselves as you " can; we will do our duty; we will no " longer be your party instruments; we " will make a stand for our own honour and " for the rights of our country." To Sir H. Mildmay the county is more indebted than to any other man I know of. Had it not been for him there would have been no election at all; and, if I am not much misinformed, to him was this well grounded and excellent petition chiefly owing. Sir H. Mildmay's opponents accuse him of being a *weathercock*; an accusation which shews the impudence of these opponents, and the folly of their partizans. He was, at the former contested election, in opposition to Mr. Pitt, and, *of course* (such was the debasement of the country), on the side of Mr. Fox. At this election he was against the friends of Mr. Fox, and on the side of the friends of Mr. Pitt, with which latter minister he had sided for some years. But, were not Mr. Windham, Lord Spencer, and Lord Fitzwilliam on the side of Mr. Fox at the former contested election? " Yes, and so " they were now." So, indeed, they were; but, they, with my *Lord Carnarvon* amongst their suite, had gone over to Mr. Pitt in the meanwhile, and they had stuck to him, too, until they thought it right, again to join Mr. Fox. So that, *if weathercock it must be*, the only difference between them and Sir Harry Mildmay, is, they had fairly boxed the compass, while he had got but half way round. This charge is, therefore, the most barefaced and most absurd that ever was alleged by impudence or believed by folly. No: this is not the fault of Sir Henry Mildmay. His fault is, or, I hope, I may say, *has been*, being a tool in the hands of underlings. And, it is really mortifying, to see a man, qualified, in every way, to act a great and independent part in a county, condescend so to be used. Upon the two occasions when I thought it necessary to animadvert on this gentleman's conduct, this fault was prominently conspicuous. In the one case, he came forward with a motion, which rendered him, in some sort, the associate of a paltry printer, and that merely, as it evidently appeared, to gratify the malice of a man, who, had he not been a minion of the minister, would, himself, in all human probability, have been nothing much better than a news-paper hack to the end of his days. The other occasion was, and, in this case the animadversion came not from my pen, when he proposed, in the House of Commons, the bringing forward of a law to effect a *compulsory composition for tithes*; a proposition, which he stated not to be his own, and which, in all probability, was suggested to him by some rattling, drinking, cock-fighting pluralist, who never set eyes upon any of his flocks except in the season for shearing them, and who, so that he could, by any means, retain quiet possession of his unearned income for life, cared not, if, thereafter, Satan himself became the head of the church. For becoming an instrument in the hands of such men there is no apology. The man who so condescends may be, in the moral sense of the words, a good man; but he is a man, in whom no thinking politician will ever, until he alter his course, greatly confide. Such a man is independent only in name. He is, as to all the effects of his conduct, the same as a placeman or pensioner during pleasure or in expectancy, with this additional disadvantage to the public, that he is not generally regarded as such; and, therefore, it is, that, for the first movement in measures more than ordinarily hostile to the properties and

liberties of the people, the crafty minister always takes special care to select some such man.——The defence of Mr. Freemantle may be safely left for the public to decide upon. They will want nothing from me to convince them, that it was a most whining, pitiful, paltry attempt to gloss over a shameful act of ministerial interference. His "*nearest* and *dearest* relations indeed!" Were General Hewett and Major Davies and all the troop of barrack-masters and barn-letting farmers and contractors and dray owners; were these, too, his "nearest and dearest relations?" Verily Mr. Thistlethwaite has reason to congratulate himself upon the discovery of this connection! I greatly over-rate the rectitude of that gentleman's mind; report has described him to me in most false colours, if he does not sorely repent of having become a member of parliament by the use of such means as have now been developed. How lamentable it is to see men like this condescending thus to be made the instruments in bringing disgrace and ruin upon their country, and, by the very same act, injury to their private fortune and their public character! A fitter man than Mr. Thistlethwaite to be a member of the county could not easily have been selected. Young, yet old enough; of character perfectly spotless; of ample fortune; of manners unaffected; and of sound sense. What could induce such a man to become a dependent? Is there any reward, any *title*, if such were his object, that can ever compensate him for the loss of his independence for one single hour. One would think, that, if such a man had nothing but the bare sight of the mansion of his forefathers to remind him of the course he ought to pursue, that alone would be sufficient to make him shun the path of the dependent.——That it was greatly desirable to put an end for ever to the power of the Roses I allow; but, this might have been done, aud *more* effectually done, without having recourse to the means which the Roses had before employed. I would, had I been in the place of either of the successful candidates, have done all in my power to extinguish the power, the ill-gotten and worse exercised power of the Roses; but never would I have taken a seat, the means of obtaining which would not bear an inquiry.——The developement must, however, be useful. It has given us information, which, had it not been for the petition, we should not have possessed. It has *proved*, that it is *the system*, the terrible Pitt system, that is our bane. It has completely exposed the professing patriots; and it has put beyond dispute, the fact, that, while this system lasts, we have nothing to hope for from a change of men.——Lord Howick seemed ashamed (and well he might!) to come forward with a recriminatory justification, and to plead, as a ground for rejecting the motion, the rejection of a similar motion, when, at the time of his opposition to Pitt, that motion was brought forward against Mr. Rose. Mr. Rose, however, adduced as a *proof* of his innocence, as a *proof* that the motion was, upon that occasion, rejected by the majority with justice, that he had afterwards prosecuted the printer of the charge, and had obtained damages! But, though *legal proof* cannot be brought of a fact, is it therefore to be regarded as false, especially when the plaintiff is *the government?* We all know how unfair such reasoning is; and, if any thing could add to our indignation in a case like this, it would be the prosecution of a printer under such circumstances.——That the facts alleged, in this debate, against the ministry of Pitt, were fully equal to those alleged against the present ministry is certain; but, my Lord Howick, how could *you*; you, you, my lord, above all men living, oppose a motion for inquiry, for mere inquiry, in a case where it was evident and undeniable, that there had been used undue influence at an election. Well do I remember, my lord, your indignation at the conduct of Pitt, when, with his placed and pensioned majority, he stifled an inquiry into the conduct of *his* Secretary of the Treasury. Your lordship's conscience must have reminded you of the occasion; but, I will here insert all the material parts of that debate; and, you and the public will see, my lord, how the conduct of Pitt and his supporters was then, what that of you and your supporters has been now. No pleasure, my lord, do I take in making such exposures: I wish to assist in supporting the present ministry; but, if my choice lies between them and truth, I must choose the latter. When, my lord, I have inserted this debate, I have a very few observations to add; nor am I certain that they will be of any use; for this debate will speak for itself.

EXTRACT FROM DEBRETT'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, 13TH MARCH, 1792.

"Mr. Thompson rose, he said, to execute a task which he had undertaken; the task of a public accuser of a public man. In consequence of rumours circulated out of doors, he had made certain inquiries, the result of which he should now submit to the house. He had undertaken this charge

purely from the sense he had of his public duty as one of the representatives of the people, totally unconnected with any animosity against the hon. gent. who was the object of this accusation. It was to his public duty that he wished to dedicate himself; and if the hon. gent. who was the object to whose conduct he wished to direct any inquiry, should be able to explain himself to the satisfaction of the house, he should be glad of it. This he said, merely for the purpose of vindicating himself against any aspersion on his character, for the impropriety of his motives. The hon. secretary of the treasury had said on a former day, that he was conscious of his innocence, and heartily courted an inquiry, and wished for the hour for his vindication. That hour was come, and he hoped that hon. gent. would not again say, he suspected him of an intention to shrink from the charge which he had thought fit to make. The rumour to which he alluded, originated in consequence of a trial in the Court of King's Bench, in which the hon. Secretary was defendant, at the suit of a Mr. Smith, for business done, in behalf of Lord Hood, at an election for Westminster. The substance of the evidence in that trial, went to charge Mr. Rose with having interfered in that election in an unwarrantable manner, and on which he founded his intentions of moving for a Committee of Inquiry upon the subject. It appeared in the evidence given on that trial, that Mr. Smith had some time before been convicted in a penalty of £50 for an offence against the Excise laws; and that afterwards, in consequence of services performed by Mr. Smith, at the request of Mr. Rose, in the course of that election, part of the fine was remitted to him. That in the course of this transaction Mr. Smith had been introduced to Mr. Rose, through the good offices of an hon. member of that house. [" Name him, name him," was generally exclaimed.] This Mr. Thompson declined, but proceeded to state the various circumstances of the conversation between Mr. Smith and Mr. Rose, by which it would appear that Mr. Rose had actually been the means of procuring a remission of part of this excise fine, for his services in the election, in behalf of the court candidate, Lord Hood. This would appear from the inquiry, beyond the possibility of a doubt. Having stated this, and also many points, on which the inference appeared to him to be clear, that this was the conduct of Mr. Rose; and having alluded to the publication of the trial of an action brought up by Mr. Smith against Mr. Rose, and the points there proved to the satisfaction of a jury, who gave Mr. Smith a verdict for the amount of his bill; and that it appeared by that trial what part Mr. Rose had acted on that occasion, he came to the conclusions to be drawn from this; and here he wished the house to reflect on the consequences of a secretary to the treasury employing the money of the public for the purpose of supporting the election of a member of that house. He wished them to reflect on the probable consequences of suffering the public to understand that their money was wasted for the corrupt purpose of procuring seats in that house for the friends of the minister. He wished them to reflect on the public contempt, if not the indignation they might, by suffering such proceedings to pass unnoticed, bring upon the whole house. They should remember, that it was on the opinion the public entertained of the house, it could be fairly said its character rested, and that it was from the people it derived the whole of its power and authority. What care then, if they wished to maintain this character, or preserve this power, should they not take to impress the people with a well-founded belief, that they would never connive at bribery and corruption. That the people are not taxed to support the corrupt elections, but to support the state. To succeed in such a practice, as had been imputed to the hon. secretary, or rather to escape an inquiry, would either lay the foundation of disturbances, and finally the downfall of our state, or totally extinguish the very principle and essence of liberty in this country. He had made this accusation. He was ready to support it by proof. The hon. gent. had asserted his innocence. Let the house grant the inquiry, and the subject would be properly adjusted. If the hon. gent. was innocent, he ought to have an opportunity of making his innocence public. If he was guilty, he should not be suffered to escape. " I have," said Mr. Thompson, " put " George Rose, Esq. fairly upon his trial, " and God send him a good deliverance." He concluded with moving, " That this " house will, upon Friday morning next, " resolve itself into a committee of the " whole house, to inquire into all abuses " committed by persons in office at the " election of a member to serve in parliament for the city of Westminster in July " 1788, as far as the same relates to penalties incurred under the excise laws, or " lottery act."

" Mr. LAMBTON rose, the house being rather clamorous. He observed that clamour and confusion should not deter him

from pursuing his duty. He first of all begged leave to say, that what he had already heard would have been sufficient for him to support the motion; but if that were not enough, he had a charge of a much more flagrant nature against those who have the conduct of public affairs—It was more criminal in point of size than that which had been first exhibited. Like his hon. friend he had no motive for the part he was about to take, but a sense of duty to his constituents, and in the very onset of the business he begged leave to assure the rt. hon. gent. opposite to him, that he disclaimed all party spleen, and had no private pique whatever on his mind against him or any man, however they might differ in opinion upon political subjects. In the year 1788, one Hoskins being at that time in prison, at the suit of the Solicitor to the lottery for 700l. in order to answer certain penalties for offences against the lottery act, for which he could not find bail, wrote to the Solicitor, telling him he could procure 50 or 60 votes for lord Hood at the Westminster election, provided he could be admitted to bail, and that such bail as he should offer would not be objected to. The Solicitor to the lottery, in answer to this, said, he could not do this on his own accord, but must have authority from a higher quarter. The man was afterwards admitted to bail, and his bail were a couple of the most miserable, wretched, shabby looking raggamuffins as ever offered to commit perjury. Their appearance shewed, that so far from being able to swear that they were worth 700l. they had not 6d. in their pockets, exclusive of the pittance that had been paid them, as the price of the scandalous crime they were hired to commit. Nay, so wretched was their appearance, that when they came to take the necessary oaths before the judge at Chambers, although they brought a note from the Solicitor to the lottery, signifying his consent to their bail, the judge's clerk thought it so impossible that the Solicitor to the lottery could mean to accept two such shabby-looking fellows as bail for 700l. that he actually refused to swear them. The fact however was, their bail was taken, and Hoskins did actually poll for lord Hood 60 votes: from which time, neither Hoskins nor his bail have been heard of. Mr. Lambton having stated this fact, observed, that the public it appeared, had paid 700l. out of their pockets for voting falsely for lord Hood. And if ministers could, as their political convenience rendered it necessary, suspend the operations of some laws, and remit the operation of others, where was the freedom of the country? All this would be proved if the committee of inquiry was granted. It would be proved, too, that other practices had been followed, equally disgraceful—the whole forming a mass of evidence that would let the public into the knowledge of circumstances, of which, at present, they had no idea. It would explain to the country the principles of modern confidence in ministers. If proved, there would, he hoped, be an end of the virtue of the confiding majority of that house. It would render the majority of the house suspected."—[The Speaker was here pleased to call the hon. gent. to order, and was supported by a general cry of "Order!" The Speaker observed, that it was quite disorderly to glance reproachfully on the conduct of a majority of that house.]—"Mr. Lambton apologized and declared, that he meant to cast no reflection on the majority or their motives; that had he not been called to order prematurely, and before he had concluded the sentiment he was uttering, he did not believe he should have been deemed disorderly, or deserving of the reproof that he had received, as he was going to add, "unless the house "granted the committee of inquiry then "moved for." Having said this, he resumed the thread of his argument, and exclaimed against the effects of corruption on the electors as well as the elected. He said, they all knew, that the Roman emperors, by bribing and corrupting the senate, governed Rome, and trampled down her liberties with as much unrestrained licence, as if there had existed no senate at all. That it was to the purity of election they were to look as to the source of freedom, and the origin of all their dearest rights and privileges. That it behoved them to be particularly watchful in times like these, when luxury and extravagance opened an easy door to corruption, by reciprocally enervating all the vigour of virtue, and all the better energies of the mind. He spoke of the splendid and brilliant eloquence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech on a late occasion, which they all so much admired, and which might fairly be termed the *Io Pæan* of the rt. hon. gent.'s finance; but he confessed, the satisfaction that speech gave him was much abated in his mind, when he learnt the manner in which the rt. hon. gent. meant to appropriate his surplus; he thought the rt. hon. gent. might have found a more soothing anodyne for the late armament, than he had presented them on that occasion; and that he might have relaxed the rigour of his excise laws, the reason of the extension of which odious system was now apparent, since it was evident that the excise was found to be an admirable

instrument of punishment or reward, of oppression or corruption. He concluded with observing, that Mr. Rose himself ought to vote for the committee, for that, if he was innocent, as he said he was, it was a duty which he owed to his character to submit it to inquiry. If he was guilty, the house was criminal in suffering him to escape from punishment. He therefore heartily seconded the motion."

"Mr. GEORGE ROSE began his defence with declaring, that he would not have persisted in endeavouring to be heard first, if he had not been so very particularly alluded to, that it became absolutely necessary that he should make an immediate reply to the charges that had been stated. The hon. gent. who made the motion, had declared that on the present occasion he came forward with no invention of his own, but that he was the mouth-piece of the public, and stated no more than the public talked of and believed; it was not a very easy matter to know precisely who the public was; every body one met was the public; and possibly the hon. gent. found the public in newspaper paragraphs and libellous pamphlets; he would not go the length of saying that what the hon. gent. had advanced was his own invention, but he could not avoid expressing his astonishment at the hon. gent.'s credulity in venturing to bring before the house in the serious and solemn manner that he had done charges, which if he did not before he sat down, prove to the satisfaction of the house, not only that every part of them was not true, but they had not in them the smallest degree of truth, nor any shadow or trace of truth whatever, he should be more mistaken than ever he had been in his life. He proceeded to state the transactions that had taken place between Mr. Smith and himself, and the greater part of what he said, he supported, by written documents. He began with explaining, that Mr. Smith had kept a livery stable, and that he had been in the habit of hiring horses of him, to go the first stage out of town, that he had not seen the man to his knowledge nor should he have known him if he had met him, before he sent him a petition enclosed in a letter, in 1789, both of which he would read to the house. The petition stated, that Mr. Smith having had an information lodged against him for brewing beer at home, had been convicted in a penalty of £50; that the beer was small beer for the use of his own family, that he was a poor man, altogether ignorant that it was contrary to law to brew small beer for the use of his family, and that he had no intention to commit any offence whatever against the laws of his country. The petition farther stated, that one third of the penalty went to the poor of the parish, one third to the informer, and the other to the king. The letter stated that the vestry of St. Margaret's were willing to give up their third of the penalty, provided he (Mr. Rose) would procure the remission of the king's other two thirds. Thus, the member of parliament through whose medium, according to the hon. gent. Smith had been introduced to him, was no other than the vestry of St. Margaret's. With the petition, he did exactly what in the ordinary course of business he ever did whenever petitions were sent to him, viz. referred it to the board to whose cognizance the subject matter belonged. Smith's petition he enclosed to Mr. Cholmondeley the chairman of the excise board, and afterwards upon another application, understanding that Mr. C. was out of town, and the petition with him, he wrote to the Secretary to beg him to get the board to suspend deciding upon Smith's case till Mr. C. came to town, and on no other account than merely because Mr. C. had the petition with him. But to shew the house of what little avail his interference had proved, the petition was rejected by the Board of Excise, and Mr. Rose read the Secretary's answer, with the decision of the Board, in which the Secretary declared, "that all the allegations were untrue; that "Smith was not a poor man; that the beer "brewed was strong; and not small beer; "that he well knew what he had done was "illegal; that he contrived to get the malt "into his house so privately, that even his "brewer, (who was the person that had "informed against him) did not know when "or whence it came, that he had long been "in the habit of brewing and conveying it "into his own cellars for sale, and that if "the penalty had been £500. instead of "£50. it would not have been adequate to "the beer he had brewed." Here, therefore, was a clear proof that he had not influenced the board in their decision. Half the penalty had actually been levied, and the other half was to be paid by instalments. This, he solemnly said, was the whole of the transaction between Smith and him, as far as regarded the penalty of £50. During the time of the last general election, Smith came to him, as he was going out, and made a proposition for opening his house, and declared in his entry, that he could detect a great number of bad votes that had been given for Lord John Townshend, when he answered, "Do so, if you can, it will be "doing a right thing," but as to any pro-

position on the subject of the election, he must go to Lord Hood's committee. He did so, found the bad votes he said he could find, and at length applied to him to be paid. The answer he gave him, was, "Return to "Lord Hood's committee, they'll pay "you." Smith afterwards again demanded payment of him, and commenced an action, which was tried in the Court of King's Bench. He would not impeach the justice of the court, nor the integrity of the jury; such a case was certainly made out as to induce them to give a verdict for Smith. These were the facts, but did any man in his senses suppose that he (Mr. Rose) if he had felt the least consciousness of being really indebted to Smith, would have suffered the cause to have gone into a court of justice? Most certainly he would not, he never had sent a man who had a demand upon him, twice from his door in the whole course of his life; but he must still think, that Smith had not a right to call on him for payment; he had opened no house, (not that he should have done wrong, if he had) nor made himself responsible in any sort whatever. In proof of the facts he had stated, Mr. Rose read a variety of papers, and after declaring, that he had stated the whole of his conduct respecting Smith; as to any thing that might have passed between him and any of the officers of the Board of Excise, he said, he hoped he was not to be made responsible for them. It was not, Mr. Rose observed, necessary for him to say much of himself, because, however party might influence gentlemen with whom he was not acquainted, the friends who knew him, he trusted, would find nothing in his character or any part of his conduct sufficient to warrant even a momentary suspicion, that he would be mean enough to act so scandalous and base a part as calumny had imputed to him; and even if, for the sake of argument, it were admitted that he could sink so low, did any person living imagine such a man as Mr. C. would join with him in such a disgraceful scene? There was not, he declared, in the world a better friend to the revenue, a man of more unimpeached integrity, nice honour and high spirit, than Mr. C. as all who knew him, he would venture to say, would readily acknowledge; nor was there, he believed, in existence, a man who would have felt more repugnance to take a part in such a business than the gentleman he was alluding to. With regard to the other charge that respecting the admitting Hoskins to bail, by sham bail, he protested he had never even heard the man's name before that day, and was it likely that Lord Hood would have desired his agent to act such a part as had been ascribed to him? It appeared to him that if Lord Hood had permitted his agent to do what had been stated, it would have been nothing less than subjecting him to have had his head put in the pillory. Mr. Rose averred, that what he had said was the whole of the transaction which he had ever had with Smith; but if any gentlemen were not disposed to believe him, it did not depend on his assertions alone; the officers of the excise were at the door, and ready to come to the bar of the house to confirm them. Neither the excise laws, nor any authority that he might be supposed to possess, had ever been made use of for any purpose that could, upon the strictest investigation, be deemed improper, much less for election purposes. But if any person could think so ill of him as to suppose he would so prostitute his situation, did they imagine the exalted characters who sat at the Treasury Board would suffer it? He concluded with saying, that if it should be necessary, the house, he hoped, would indulge him in giving such explanations as might be called for."

"Mr. GREY [now Lord Howick] supported the motion, and maintained, that nothing had been stated in the course of the debate to make it appear, that the house ought not to grant the committee that had been moved for. He laid great stress on the case of Hoskins, and said, the hon. gent. had solemnly declared, that he never caused any mitigation of the penalty which Smith had incurred under the excise laws to be made. He begged to know if he had not done it through Mr. Vivian, the Solicitor to the Board of Excise? He produced a note, dated April, 1789, from Mr. Rose to Mr. Smith, appointing him to meet Mr. Vivian at 8 o'clock the next morning, at his own house in Palace Yard. With regard to what the hon. gent. had said, in denial that Mr. Smith applied to him through the medium of a member of parliament, and had termed that member of parliament the vestry, the hon. gent's. memory must have been very imperfect, and must have failed him wonderfully if he recollected nothing of the circumstance. To refresh his memory, he would mention who the member was, the member for Liverpool. Upon the whole, he contended, that there was enough before the house to induce them to inquire into it, *and the hon. gentlemen on the other side, unless they felt that something would come out in that inquiry, which they did not wish to be known, ought to be among the first to propose a committee, and the last to shrink from*

the motion. If they, on their side, had stated, what they could not prove, it might be the more disadvantageous to them to have a committee, but so far from entertaining such an idea, he would end with saying, that the house ought to go into a committee."

"Mr. Fox said, it occurred to him that the hon. gent. who had brought this subject forward, had stated ground sufficient for an inquiry into this case. The question was, whether such interference had taken place, on the part of the ministers, as had been stated; or whether, upon the stated interference, there was ground for inquiry? To this it was objected, that the charges were false. Then it was replied,—"We can "prove all this by papers we shall lay upon "your table; we shall prove this beyond "dispute by oral testimony; we can prove "the whole of our allegation. We can "prove first, that some how or other this "man got out of prison; we can prove that "having done so, he polled for Lord Hood. "We can prove that he was detained for "700l. on a clause of having incurred the "penalty of the Lottery act; we can prove "that he came out by sham bail; we can "prove that all this is traced to the autho-"rity of gentlemen in office; that it was "under the inspection of the Solicitor of "the Lottery." What then follows? That the house shall pronounce a minister guilty? No! Only that they should inquire. The whole of this would be produced in evidence. It would be produced in evidence, that an application was made to the Solicitor on behalf of this very man; nay, by himself, to the Solicitor of the Lottery, stating the cause of his confinement, and stipulating the condition of his release; that sham bail was proposed to be offered; that the Solicitor said he must consult others from whom he received his authority. Something more, that lord Hood had actually paid his attorney's bill, in which is contained an item for the expense of conducting this very act! for procuring bail, and effecting the discharge of this very person! Was this not enough to enter on an inquiry? A man in prison for the sum of 700l. under a penal statute, to be discharged on condition of serving an election candidate, by the worst of all means—perjury and corruption! The bare suspicion of this ought to make a man impatient for an opportunity of making his defence. Why then not go into the committee? The other part of the charge which applied to the hon. secretary, met with a curious reception from that hon. gent. He says, that his conduct is plain and above-board. If so, why refuse to inquire into it? What is there to fear if your conduct is fair? The note sent by Mr. Rose, to Mr. Smith was, that Mr Rose wished to see him on the next morning, and stating that he had some business to settle with him, and that if he came, he would have an opportunity of meeting Mr. Cholmondeley. Was this pure civility of introducing them to each other? Had the hon. secretary no other use for his house? Was there to be no conversation on the excise fine? Was it probable, that being left with each other, without a third person, for the secretary was not there, that Smith would not have mentioned the fine which he had been ordered to pay? Pure civility this, no doubt! This was, in his opinion, a strong instance in which the house were called upon to interfere.—The hon. secretary had observed that he must admire the credulity of gentlemen who believed what they had heard on the subject of the excise fine, or that Smith's demand upon the hon. secretary was just. He was of opinion there was nothing due, or he would not have resisted the demand. It was his constant practice never to suffer any person to call twice for one just demand. All this might be very true, but the answer to it was, that the jury to whom this case was referred decided otherwise. The house had the assertion of the secretary of the treasury against the solemn decision of the jury. In the opinion of the jury, the hon. gent. notwithstanding his knowledge, was mistaken. In the proof which Mr. Smith had to adduce he was mistaken. In the proof that was to be given against him on this subject, he pretended to have complete knowledge. Whether he had better acquaintance with the disposition of that house than he had with the integrity of the jury, he knew not: but he must think it would be unfortunate for this country if he could control its decision. If he could not, the opinion he had given of his sagacity in the former case, gave him no great pretension to be regarded for prophetic powers that would supersede the necessity of inquiry in that house, by anticipating the effect. Upon this trial evidence was given, that something in the nature of a remission of a fine was made from Mr. Rose to Mr. Smith. No such thing, says Mr. Rose. What then should the house say—Yes, or No? Neither. Let us inquire, was the only answer they could honestly make."

"Mr. Chancellor Pitt opposed the motion for inquiry. He observed that the question which he put to gentlemen who supported this motion had not been answered; instead of giving him any answer, they had given him arguments; the question

being still unanswered. his objections remained unremoved upon this subject. When gentlemen on the other side talk of a penalty being remitted, and being asked who it was who remitted it—would they undertake to make out any criminal charge against gentlemen high in office? That was the nature of the motion, and not that of asserting any thing against the Solicitor of the Lottery, or of the Board of Excise. These complaints, if true, would not make any thing out against gentlemen high in office, consequently afford no support to the present motion. If this charge was to be made, against whom was it to be made? They had not so much as stated the person against whom the charge was to be made—that they should prove it when made, or that even they themselves believed it. He contended that this was too vague to found a criminal inquiry upon, and a subject by no means likely to reward the house for the trouble which it would incur by this inquiry. The question was, "whether there was pre-"sumption enough for that house to form "a rational belief that the charges would "be specially made out," and on this he was clearly of opinion there was no prospect that the house would have any such evidence. *He professed himself a friend to a sober and rational inquiry*, on fair grounds stating the probability of guilt in the persons accused, *but this was not the case in the present instance, and the house would not vote a criminal inquiry upon conjecture, surprise, or insinuation, however ingeniously or vehemently supported. To take up the time of the house upon these unfounded inquiries, would only impede the progress of public business, and derogate from the dignity which belonged to the deliberative character of the house.* In cases like these, if the house adopted the motion, no character, however exalted in station, or however distinguished by integrity, would be safe from accusation for a moment. In order to set inquiry on foot, it was only to make a charge, and to maintain it by as many hard words as possible, and that house must enter into a public inquiry without the slightest foundation. These things he wished to put to the integrity and common sense of the house, and to ask them to reflect, whether by the dictates of either, they felt themselves called upon to vote for the inquiry."

"The Attorney General, after having expressed his surprise at what he had heard that day, declared the sum Hoskins had given bail to, was neither more nor less than an action of debt sued out by Mr. Frost, the Solicitor of the Lottery, as a mere individual. Had it been any thing in which government was in any way concerned, Mr. Frost would have been bound in duty to have consulted him as to the bail; but that had not been the case. Mr. Frost, he said, on his own accord, had brought actions against different persons, on the Lottery acts, for the recovery of penalties, to the amount of 8 or 9,000l., merely to make out a charge upon the Stamp Office of 2,000l. for what he had done, which was the recovering about 150l. On the occasion of Hoskins, Mr. Frost had not insulted him, by offering sham bail to his consideration, or he should not have done it with impunity. In fact, in the particular instance, he had acted as a mere individual. He explained it to the house, that actions for penalties, as the law stood at present, could be brought by any individual who chose it, and that the consequence was, they were compromised in the most scandalous manner repeatedly, and that he not being in possession of the evidence, could not effectually interfere. The only way to prevent this, would be to enact in future, that no action for a penalty should be brought but by the Attorney General. The Judges, he said, had done him the honour to consult him on the subject, and had complained of the frequency of the compromises. He repeated, that Hoskins was imprisoned on an action of debt to Frost as a mere individual, and declared, that he did not know one case in which he received a scrap of paper from Frost. He reasoned upon the item of the three guineas charged by Frost to lord Hood, and said, so far from its affording any proof that persons high in office had been guilty of corrupt practices, it almost to a demonstration proved the contrary. The grounds that had been laid down were far too slight for the house to go into a committee upon, and they ought not to go into a committee, unless they were pretty snre of success."

"Mr. M. A. Taylor said, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side would content themselves with the deliverance which flying from trial would give them, he wished them much honour of their acquittal. The public would decide on the purity of those who durst not stand trial. The facts alleged against them were as specific as it was possible to make them, in the present stage

of the business. It was directly charged upon the Solicitor of the Lottery, and the auspices under which he acted, that he had suffered an accused person to escape by sham and Jew bail, because he had engaged to bring sixty votes in favour of a Lord of the Admiralty. It was expressly charged upon the Secretary of the Treasury, that he had engaged to bring a person, convicted of a penalty for an offence against the Excise laws, to a private conference with the Solicitor to the Excise, in his own house, on his promising to perform certain services in the said election. These were specific charges, and yet it was objected that there was too much generality in the accusation At a time when the imputations against the Secretary of the Treasury for meddling in elections, were so round, the delicacy of that house alone was not to be offended by whispering an insinuation. Did they really think he was not active in his interferences? Did they not know how various, how multiform, his appearances were, whenever he could be seen or felt with effect? He called upon the house therefore to stand forward, and vindicate themselves, by searching to the bottom a charge fairly and candidly brought before them."

" Mr WHITBREAD said, the accusation was as specific as, in the present stage, it ought to be. His hon. friend ought not, in his mind, to name the person high in office against whom his proofs lay; his naming him now might deprive him of those very proofs. Let the right hon. gent., for instance, reflect what ought to be his conduct if he himself were the high person alluded to. He had the complete power, by his eloquence, by his influence, to grant or to stifle inquiry, as he should find that the proofs were feeble, or that they were conclusive. If he made it a previous doctrine, therefore, that the person should be named, and that all the chain of proof should be exposed, he crushed all inquiry against a minister pending his power, and against all subordinate officers. The dignity, the feelings of gentlemen in office, demanded that they should be the first to entreat the house to grant the inquiry. Not to be forward in soliciting it themselves would be to give suspicion of guilt—innocence would be eager for justification—it could not sleep under accusation—" Go," it would say to its friends, " relieve me from the torture of suspicion. " I have lost my rest; I cannot sleep till I " am justified." What sort of friendship must that be, which, instead of eagerly bringing the accuser to his proofs, forbids all inquiry, and dooms innocence " to sleep " no more!" It was not to be imagined that his Majesty's ministers could persist in shrinking from the only legitimate means which they had of an honourable acquittal."

" Mr. WINDHAM said, that the very unaccountable language of that day induced him to rise, not because he thought it possible to adduce any new arguments in support of the motion, but because to be silent under the doctrines which had been advanced, would be to desert his duty, and to prostitute his feelings. The doctrines had themselves been strange; they had been more strange from the quarter whence they had originated. They militated against every principle of jurisprudence which the wisdom of ages had matured, or which the practice of all our courts had sanctioned; and yet they were brought forward by lawyers. A conduct had been held by his majesty's ministers, which certainly did not greatly tend to the elevation of the house, and which he knew not how they could reconcile with their own dignity. They had recourse to a scrupulous nicety, under which a man of honour, charged with the suspicion of guilt, would have disdained to shelter himself, a mere verbal insufficiency, and taking refuge in the desperate practice of self-convicted and timorous offenders in our criminal courts, they had literally got off by a flaw in the indictment. They said, " it is neces- " sary that you shall name the person high " in office whom you charge, and unless " you specify the offender, you shall not be " permitted to inquire, although you assert " that there is positive guilt."—" Why, " Sir," said Mr. Windham, " even taking it with this captious objection, their scruple ought to be removed, when the hon. gent. (Mr. Thompson) fairly tells you, that the Secretary of the Treasury is personally charged. Is not the Secretary of the Treasury a public man in high authority? Is he not a great man by his salaries? Is he not a public man by his trusts and offices? View him in all his aspects—he is every way a public man—and he is personally accused. But the learned gent. asserts it as a legal doctrine, that there ought not to be an inquiry unless there is a great and infinite probability of guilt. Is this, Sir, the practice of any one court in England? There ought not to be a trial, I admit, without a certain degree of suspicion; *but there ought to be an inquiry wherever there is a charge, and wherever there is an open and avowed accuser. A man ought not to be brought before a jury of his peers to answer to a frivolous and vexatious charge, but will you say that the grand jury shall not examine the bill? To deny an*

inquiry is to bar the door against justice. It is contrary to the first principles of jurisprudence. It is what a band of criminals would rejoice in, but it would be fatal to innocence. We state that there is positive guilt, we have record of positive guilt. We have the proof that a public officer suffered a person, accused of an offence against law, to escape, for a corrupt reason, offensive to the dignity of this house, outrageous to the representation of the people: and we have it presented to us, that he did this with the connivance of higher persons. We demand that this bill be examined. We demand that the house shall go into a committee, to see whether persons in office did, or did not, convert the public revenue into an instrument of election abuse. Granting a committee is not going to trial; but if you say, that you ought not to inquire, when abuse is stated, you lay down a principle unknown in any court in the world! You say, in so many words at least, that the English House of Commons shall establish for its own conduct a doctrine to screen guilt and to torture innocence. Another doctrine, advanced by the learned gent. is certainly equally against his own practice in the courts. "There "ought to be proof that the witnesses are "credible." Why, Sir, was it ever heard of that the credibility of the witnesses became a question, till they came to give their evidence? till it was seen what stress was to be laid on their testimony? This new way of taking character by anticipation is a doctrine so new and so contrary to all practice, that I confess it astonishes me to hear it advanced; and against all this we have the assertion of the gentlemen themselves. "I "assure you," say they, "these witnesses "are not deserving of credibility; trust us, "the accused persons; we assure you of our "innocence; and here let there be an end." Sir, they must surely entertain a higher opinion of the credulity of this house, than even their recent experience can justify, if they think that their confiding talent will be carried to this length. But if it is, then the majority will, upon reflection, see the true picture of their own conduct; they will see whether the imputations that have been thrown upon them, of giving confidence for reasons which they have never been so good as to explain, are not fairly to be ascribed to them. They will do more: this administration, which it has been their fashion to paint without, however, having any proofs to exhibit—certainly without any instances of purity, which they please to advance, as a perfect paragon of purity and virtue, will now stand unmasked and exposed in their natural and true colours. The gay embroidered suit of pretence, in which they have decked themselves, and under which they have strutted in magnificent disguise, is torn off, and they behold them in the tattered rags of their genuine deformity. They stand like the uncased Frenchman, which the licentiousness of our stage is too apt to exhibit in ridicule—in ruffles without a shirt—in tinsel and lace on the outside—in dirt and dowlas within—they stand before their confiding majority, convicted of shrinking from trial, and when a man does not dare to stand trial, the world have a right to believe him guilty; and in this condition stands his Majesty's ministers in the eyes of their majority. Let me add, Sir, one word more on this serious subject. We have before us two pregnant instances of the use which is made of these summary and shameful proceedings, which are introduced into practice for the sake of our darling revenue; *that revenue for which every thing is to be sacrificed—the citizen to be oppressed and ruined—the constitution to be violated. We see that these summary modes of conviction may be dexterously perverted into instruments of favour or of fear, as it may be the political and corrupt motive of office, for the moment, to gratify or to intimidate.* You see the fact in glaring truth before you. It remains for you to shew to your constituents, suffering under these abominable laws, whether you will not at least provide against tue profligate perversion of them to other ends than revenue."

"Mr. MARTIN said, that though he was of opinion that an inquiry ought to be granted, and even that if the motion were rejected, *eternal disgrace would fall on the house*; yet he hoped it would be rejected, as such a circumstance *could not fail to open the eyes of the public to the imperfections of the present system of representation*, and convince them of the necessity of a parliamentary reform."—The house divided,—Ayes, 84; Noes, 221.

Now, my Lord Howick, how do you feel, after a look in this glass? Nay, my lord, laugh not. It is no laughing matter, and that you, and those who now back you will find. Could you, my lord, look me, or any man like me, in the face, after the perusal of this debate, bearing in your mind what passed on the 13th instant? If you could, I would not exchange the bit of paper, upon which I am writing in defence of my country's rights, for your office, your title, and your fortune to boot, if I were therewith compelled to take your mind and your heart. But, I will do you the justice to say, that I do not think you could look me in the face,

I am well aware of the state of your mind upon such an occasion; and I regret, that any consideration whatever should have made you consent so to enthral yourself. Your lordship once said, in proposing a reform of parliament, that, in spite of "the *calumnious* assertion, that, if you were *in power*, you would be the last to propose such a measure, you should proceed in the discharge of your duty." Was the assertion "*calumnious*," my lord? Here, my lord, it is that our malady lies. Here are the seeds of death. It is the all-subduing system of Pitt. "What," said Sir F. Burdett, in the debate just referred to (26 March, 1797). "What was the cause of "the French revolution? The progress of "reason and philosophy? Reason and philosophy can boast of no such influence "over mankind. The revolution was caused "by the extravagance, profligacy, and insolence of the administration. The same "causes are operating with us; and highly "as I esteem the talents of the Right Hon. "Gent. (Mr. Fox), *even he could do nothing "substantial for the benefit of the people, "were he minister to-morrow, without an "entire change in our system of politics; "nor, even then, unless there be a full and "free representation of the people in parliament.*" Perhaps, my lord, that this, which was said in support of your motion, you will *now* call jacobinism; but, be assured, that every honest and sensible man in the country will say, that events have fully proved it to be *true*.

SLAVE TRADE.

Copy of a Letter from LORD NELSON *to Mr. Simon Taylor of Jamaica, dated, Victory off Martinico, June* 10, 1805.

DEAR SIR,——I was in a thousand fears for Jamaica; for that is a blow which Buonaparté would be happy to give us. I had no hesitation in forming my judgment, and I flew to the West Indies without any orders; but, I think the ministry cannot be displeased. Information at Barbadoes from St. Lucia told us, that the enemy's squadron had sailed with 5000 troops on the 28th of May, and were seen standing to the Southward, therefore, Tobago, Trinidad, or Grenada was supposed their object. I went to these islands, but now find the whole was a fabrication, for the enemy did not leave Fort Royal till the night of the 5th of June. On the 6th they were under Dominica. On the 7th under Guadaloupe standing to the northward, supposed either to try and carry Antigua, or are trying to escape from me. The Carthagena squadron was at sea, but returned on hearing I was close to them. They could have no troops that ought to make my Jamaica friends alarmed. When I am satisfied they are on their return, after sending some of the Spanish ships to the Havannah, I shall push hard to get off the Streights before them, and kind Providence may some happy day bless my endeavours to serve the empire, of which the West India colonies form so prominent and interesting a part. I have ever been, and shall die a firm friend to our colonial system. I was bred as you know in the good old school, and taught to appreciate the value of our West India possessions, and neither in the field nor in the senate, shall their interest be infringed while I have an arm to fight in their defence or a tongue to launch my voice against the damnable and cursed doctrine of * * * * * and his hypocritical allies, and I hope my birth in heaven will be as exalted as his, who would certainly cause the murder of all our friends and fellow subjects in the colonies; however, I did not intend to go so far; but the sentiments are full in my heart, and the pen would write them.—I shall as soon as I have done with this fleet go to England for a few months, and if you have time and inclination, I shall be glad to hear from you; we are near thirty years acquainted, and I am as ever, &c.——(Signed)——NELSON AND BRONTE.

12th of June off Antigua. The combined squadrons passed here on the 8th, and I am after them. Jamaica is safe, on which I congratulate you most sincerely.

ORDNANCE OFFICE.

SIR,——A proposal, revolting to the feelings and judgment of a large and estimable portion of the military force of the country, having appeared in your last Register, under the signature, Philo-Register, dated 8th November last, I rely on your candour for the admission of a few remarks on it. The writer alluded to, evidently sensible of the obnoxious tendency of his intentions, assumes the disguise of an old woman, interested in the fate of the funds, and affecting anxiety for your advice to avert apprehended ruin by their failure. Instead, however, of waiting for the guidance solicited, this sagacious writer offers a remedy for all the embarrassments of our financial system, in aid of the economy recommended by you: and expecting (like an ostrich covering its eyes to escape being seen) that the borrowed petticoat of the old woman will hide the jackboots of the horse guards, seriously suggests that great saving of expence and much general improvement would be effected, by trans-

ferring the authority of the Master General and Board of Ordnance to the direction of the Commander-in-Chief. The fiction of the writer's being a fund-holder is by no means ill imagined; neither is the garb of concealment adopted on this occasion injudiciously chosen, or inappropriate to the illustrious Field-Marshal, whose patronage is endeavoured to be increased. Communion of interests and passions between the parasites of the horse-guards, and the fund-dealers of Lloyd's is perfectly natural; and if ever their mutual favourite shall attain the desired extension of his power, it will assuredly be by their united efforts. But, dark as are our political prospects in other respects, such a change is no longer within the range of probability. The empty and greedy ambition of Clerk-Colonels or Colonel-Clerks, may prompt them to abortive attempts to advance the power and popularity of their Chief; and an agent, unsatisfied with the share of the ordnance agency which he is allowed to retain, may strive by similar puny essays to be restored to the whole.—But they will labour in vain. Their strength is unequal to the heaping Pelion on Ossa. Never will they see the Duke of York at the head of the ordnance. To retain his present station, gradually circumscribed in authority, is the utmost expectation he can now rationally form. A successful invasion of the tranquil provinces of the ordnance department, regulated by wise institutions, and happy under the paternal government of an amiable and enlightened nobleman, a general by long and gallant service, is no longer practicable.—Cooperation for such a purpose cannot be supposed from any man of honesty and ability in the country. That the attempt should first appear in your paper, Mr. Cobbett, would excite surprise, if your impartiality, and encouragement to fair and free discussion, were not as conspicuous as your public-spirit. But I cannot for a moment entertain the idea that *you* will behold with indifference an attempt to extend the sway of the Duke of York to the most valuable part of our military force; which hitherto, under a Master General, has been handed down to us from our ancestors, high in character and unrivalled in professional skill. To secure your aid against such an attempt, I am convinced nothing more is requisite than to present it to your notice. I shall now, therefore, revert to the shallow pretences alleged for the proposed alteration. The superior accommodations of the engineers and artillery, and their staff appointments, are the only grounds assigned ——I answer that—the artillery barracks are better than those of the line, only because (like the barracks of the marines, which are equally comfortable for the same reason) they are inalienable depots, always occupied by the same corps. Besides, however desirable it might be to render all barracks equally commodious (which would be the only rational object) yet, what seems to be this wiseacre's plan, the reducing them to the same standard of misery, would not be effected by placing the ordnance under the controul of the Commander-in-Chief, while the services of the line and artillery should remain distinct. The pseudo Philo-Register's other objection is as palpably unfounded. On this head I reply to him that—if the staff, in the appointments on which the engineers and artillery now participate in some small proportion, be too extensive (which I readily admit it is) the whole blame, for such a wanton waste of the public treasure, belongs exclusively to the Commander in-Chief, who alone is allowed to influence its extent. That general officers of the engineers and artillery should be precluded from appointments on the staff, cannot, surely, be rationally contended for. But, without insisting on their equal claims, it will be sufficient to observe, that if a certain number of general officers are to have staff pay, no saving of expence would be obtained by the unjust exclusion of any particular corps from furnishing its proportion. Having thus shewn that no advantage would attend the transfer of power recommended, I do not consider it incumbent on me to illustrate, at much length, the danger and absurdity of a change; by which the security to the public money resulting from the established checks of a wisely constituted regular board would be wildly relinquished for the management of an irresponsible individual. I shall, therefore, content myself with submitting two questions, on which the public are fully qualified to decide by the interesting reports of the Commissioners of Military Inquiry —1st Can the impolicy of unrestricted confidence in an individual be more strongly exemplified than in the case of General Delancey?—2d Is it not evident that all the frauds and improvident bargains recently detected in the barrack department, would have been prevented, if the superintendence thereof had remained under the Board of Ordnance instead of being entrusted to an individual.—It is unnecessary to my present purpose to press these topics farther. Your correspondent's assertion too, that "the Master Ge-" neral of the Ordnance ought not to be a " cabinet minister," being unsupported by argument, and evidently absurd, might be

dismissed with contempt. But the position ought to attract attention at this conjuncture, because there is some danger lest the total indifference of the public towards the present Secretary at War, might generate a similar apathy on a point of much constitutional importance; viz. the exclusion from the cabinet of a minister, who is the sole check-officer over the pay of the army, amounting to fourteen millions a year. I, therefore, assert and undertake to prove, in contradiction to this dangerous doctrine, that it is essential to the proper conduct of the affairs of the state, and to the character of the administration (if it value character), that every member of the ministry, who is head of a department, entrusted with large sums of the public treasure, ought also to be a member of the cabinet, in which measures and expenditures are discussed.—I must not, however, encroach further at present on your valuable Register.—MILES.—*London, Jan.* 26, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 5.

"Learning, truly so called, consists in the possession of knowledge and in the capacity of communicating that knowledge to others; and, as far as my observation will enable me to speak, what are called the *learned* languages, operate as a bar to the acquirement of real learning. I already hear some pedagogue, or pedant, exclaim, 'this is precisely the reasoning of the Fox without a tail.' But, to bring this matter to the test, I hereby invite the *learned* gentlemen of the two Universities to a discussion upon the subject. I assert that what they call the learned languages are improperly so called; and that, as a part of general education, they are worse than useless."—POL. REGISTER, Vol. XI. p. 36.

SIR,——In addressing to you a few comments upon this assertion of yours, excuse me, if, in compliment to your own style of writing, I should make use of some harsh and unmannerly expressions. And, on the strength of this freedom of speech being granted to me, I may, perhaps, in the first place, be justified in declaring, that it is impossible to say, whether the above passage be more remarkable for the ignorance, or for the insolence, which it betrays. The air of arrogance, and the dogmatical tone which you have assumed in laying down your position, exceeds any thing which I ever met with in the most determined pedant, or illiterate coxcomb.—Of you, Mr. Cobbett, it is particularly unworthy, who have on many occasions displayed your pretensions to the character of a sensible man. To condescend to argue the question which you have proposed for discussion, in detail, would be 'worse than useless', it would be rank folly: it would be exhibiting the beauty of colours and proportion to the blind, and throwing away the charms of music upon the dead. No; thanks be to the 'learned languages,' their cause requires not the support of such advocates as either you or myself. "The sound hath gone forth throughout the earth," and I am enabled by the statement of a mere, simple fact, to convince even you, Sir, of your absurdity, and of your audacious and unexampled effrontery. Answer me this question, Sir! To whom has "learning, properly so called, which consists in the possession of knowledge, and in the capacity of communicating it to others," been principally and almost exclusively indebted? (Of course the proposed inquiry applies chiefly to the present state of learning in this country, and to its progress since the revival of, what is usually called, Letters.) Sir, I much doubt, whether you can answer this question to me, as a man, for I strongly suspect, that the works and history of those illustrious characters, to whom I allude, are, for the most part, unknown to you. I will, therefore, myself, answer the question for you, in part: I will tell you, who have been the great friends and supporters of learning, properly so called, as they have distinguished themselves in almost every department of learning and science. Bacon, Milton, Locke, Boyle, Newton, Swift, Pope, and Addison, have, by their learning, been principally instrumental in enlarging the sphere of knowledge, and in contributing, moreover, by their works, to the civilization and happiness of mankind. This catalogue will hereafter be enriched with the names of other most estimable and distinguished characters of the same school. Chatham, Burke, Fox, Paley, Priestley, Horne Tooke, and the late amiable and truly learned Beattie, together with, almost invariably, the brightest ornaments of the modern bar, and the most enlightened dignitaries of the church, are among those to whom true knowledge is under the greatest obligations. Can you suppose, Mr. Cobbett, that your own posthumous fame, for instance, will ever bear, for a moment, to be put in competition with that of the above named accomplished and learned scholars? And whence did these men gather their knowledge, and acquire such undoubted claims to superior wisdom and virtue? Did the history of their own country only, and their own mother tongue, supply them with those stores of erudition and good taste, by which their minds were so greatly enriched and improved? Did the Goths and Vandals, and Anglo-Saxons, transmit to them the knowledge of the 'ingenuous arts,' and

those treasures of natural, moral, and political philosophy, which their labours have so abundantly dispensed to us? Or did they derive their wisdom at second hand only? through the weak medium of English translations from the works of the learned Greeks and Romans? No! no! Sir; these great scholars digged and delved for the precious ore itself in the very mines of ancient Greece and Rome. Their labours became more and more animated and persevering, from the idea of hearing those illustrious philosophers of antiquity speak for themselves; and from the hope of being able, in some degree, to hold converse with them in the same language. Their honourable ardour could not rest, till they were put in possession of the true riches. In order to think as they thought, they found it necessary to be able to speak as they spake.—Of the insipidity and inadequacy of translations, you, yourself, may have some tolerable conception. You would not think, that a good article of your own in the Political Register *(si magnis liceat componere parva)* could have justice done to it by a translation into any language upon earth. (And yet, perhaps, that would be the best touchstone on which to try its real merit.) Nor would you be desirous, that your spirit and talents, as a political writer, should be measured by the awkward and puny standard of a translation. Is not the same reasoning applicable, in an infinitely higher degree, to translations from the learned Greek and Roman authors? Are the sentiments and genius of Homer, Xenophon, Thucidydes, Demosthenes, Plato, Aristotle, and of those deeply learned Græco-Romans, Cicero and Horace, Virgil and Quintilian, to be studied to advantage in a language not their own? In order to feel, to catch, and to communicate the true taste and philosophical genius of Cicero, you must read Cicero. So thought Locke, when in enforcing the opinion of La Bruyere, he says: "The sudy of the original text can never be sufficiently recommended. It is the shortest, surest, and most agreeable way to all sorts of learning. Draw from the spring head, and take not things at second hand. Let the writings of the great masters be never laid aside; dwell upon them, settle them in your mind, and cite them upon occasion."

'Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ.'

And now, Sir, will not the above short allusion to the names and acquirements of our wisest men and philosophers, or, in other words, of those who "as far as we know and can judge, possessed the greatest degree of knowledge, and had the capacity of communicating it to others," completely answer and refute your rude denunciation against the utility of the 'learned languages!' Is not this argument, as founded on facts, indisputable? For observe the dilemma into which a rejection of this argument would place you You would have to prove, that a large majority of our countrymen, who are now ignorant of what are called the "learned languages," do, in fact, possess an equal, or greater degree of knowledge, than the 'learned gentlemen' who have been educated at our two Universities, but that unhappily, hitherto, they have not had the desire, or capacity, to communicate it to others." '*De non apparentibus quasi de non existentibus, eadem est ratio,*' says the proverb. And strange indeed it is, that not one truly learned, though originally poor man, in ten thousand, appears among us, who has not been indebted to the study of the 'learned languages,' for the expansion and improvement of his mind, for his knowledge, and, in many instances, for his virtues; while the million, whose time and talents are unfettered by the trammels and absurdities of Greek and Latin syntax, remain, generally speaking, in the back ground; unable, in the smallest degree, to cope with their classical friends (for I will not call them their adversaries) in the improvement of, and communication of, those arts and sciences, which most embellish and dignify human nature. Let it also be remarked, that the great majority, even, of our first rate mathematicians and natural philosophers, such as Newton, Locke, Boyle, &c. (the promoters of sciences not so immediately connected with an acquaintance with the 'learned languages') has been composed of great scholars, properly so called. Yet it would be possible to mention the names of *some* excellent and first rate mathematicians and mechanics, both ancient and modern, who have made little, or no progress in Grecian and Roman literature; not from want of inclination to do so, but, from want of opportunity to prosecute such studies; for they gratefully acknowledge their eternal obligations to the conservators and translators of the works of Euclid, and will ever revere the memory and talents of an Archimedes, Eudoxus, and Archytas But the fewness of their numbers, comparatively speaking, adds strength to my argument; inasmuch as it affords a further proof, that the study of the learned languages, instead of operating, as you assert, as 'a bar' to the acquirement of real learning, is, in every branch of it, on the contrary, as satisfactory as it is desirable. I leave you to

make the best of this actual result. I will just mention one other argument, as it regards the ability which attends the studying of the 'learned languages'; and that is, that the attainment of the rudiments of those languages has a peculiar tendency to quicken the powers of observation, to excite, and to form, accurate perceptions of things: and to induce habits of close investigation. It, moreover, wonderfully assists in the improvement of the faculty of the memory, rendering it technically and most extensively useful; and it is worthy also of observation, that this advantage and improvement of the mind is usually acquired at an age when the youth of the lower classes of the community (who have this avenue to science thrown open to them, by the munificence and liberality of those excellent persons, who, after the example of our immortal King Alfred, have been the founders of free grammar schools) could add little to the public stock of industry by their personal labour; and when it would be difficult to say, what study more generally useful could be adopted, to employ the time, to fix the attention, and strengthen the faculties of youth, at that particular age, previously to their engaging with success in any other liberal pursuit or occupation, to which their various circumstances or condition in life, or inclination might lead them. The mistake, into which your arrogance has led you, is, that, like many others, you would argue against the use of a thing, in consequence of its abuse. An error into which nothing but the most malignant spirit of detraction, and the overflowings of ignorance and conceit, could have betrayed you on the present occasion. As justly, and almost as gratefully, might you have considered the art of printing, and the liberty of the press (from whence, as from an "*alma mater*" you have derived what little light, and information, and consequence you have) to be, like the learned languages, 'a bar to,' or inimical to, the best interests of mankind, because of the abuse to which they are daily subjected by the folly, the malignity, and selfish designs of those who have recourse to them. For want of a critical knowledge of the 'learned languages,' you have, yourself, been unable to discover, "that it is nothing but men's laziness which hath encouraged pedantry to cram, rather than to enrich, libraries, and to bury good authors under heaps of notes and commentaries." (Locke from La Bruyère.)—I will only notice one other particular, which in the pride and waggishness of your heart, you have introduced into your notable and indecent challenge. 'I already hear,' say you, 'some pedagogue or pedant exclaim: this is precisely the reasoning of the Fox *without a tail.*" What! would you make the pedant more stupid than he really is? Who, that had not his conceptions obfuscated by the fumes of his own insolence, would compare you, under the present supposition of a *want of learning*, to the fox which had *lost his tail?* For that, I fancy, is the fable to which you allude, when you talk of the fox *without a tail.*—Sir, the absolutely, thorough-bred, no-tail'd foxes have been extinct in our country, I believe, for many generations past. I have been after those animals, man and boy, these many years, and yet you are the first *live* creature of the kind, that has presented itself to me. Now I have gotten hold of you by the stump, methinks, it would be a good thing to put you into a bag, and to turn you out, on some fine morning, before our——gallant pack: depend upon it, we would rattle your old stiff rump well for you. But, good Sir, you never had a tail to *lose:* (that is, you were never in possession of the learned languages); ergo, you are not circumstanced like the fox to which you compare yourself in the fable, who had *forfeited* his tail (as many of his betters have done their heads) for his villainy. For it was *in consequence of the loss of his tail*, that the fox in the table was enabled so ingeniously to plead the want of it, as an advantage, to his compatriots. There would have been much more sense in comparing yourself to the fox, who was unable to reach the grapes. But there is another fable, now I think of it, which, if possible, is still more applicable to yourself. It is prettily told in the Latin language—allow me to transcribe it for your edification, and permit me, at the same time, to subjoin an attempt at doing it into English, that you may thoroughly understand it.

Mulus.

Lascivientem plurimo hordeo mu'um
Quondam hæc superba cogitatio incessit:
Ego pulcher inquit; ego celerrimus cursor;
Patrem habui equum, qui aurata fræna mandebat.
Hæc ille: sed mox, incidente currendi
Necessitudine, impeditus, atque hærens,
Ad prima campi spatia restitit lassus;
Asinique patris e:t statim recordatus.

An ale-drinking wight, full of hiccough, and play
Thus said to himself, as he scribbl'd away:
"Who so clever as I? such a scholar, and wag?
"My father a——— who chew'd the best shag!"
Scarcely out were the words, when it happen'd, hard-by,
A Latin quotation attracted his eye;
Baffled, bungling, and blund'ring, in vain, o'er the page,
He very soon threw it away in a rage!

Yet asham'd, and confounded, at what came to pass,
He then was reminded—he was but an *ass!*

How easy, but how detestable a thing it is, Mr. Cobbett, to be scurrilous! Since the passage, quoted from your Register, which has occasioned this long letter, is no less than a formal challenge from you to the friends and patrons of the 'learned languages' and consequently (as has been proved) is an attack upon learning itself, I am, therefore, far from presuming to think, that you might not receive a much abler answer than mine, which I communicate to you under the signature of 'Anacharsis,' in allusion to the name of an ancient admirer and patron of Grecian literature and science. Whose fame, however honorably recorded as a scholar, must, nevertheless, for the present, 'vail' to your modern reputation as a libeller. The best answer to your challenge, as to many others, I am persuaded, would be, to take no notice of it at all: and possibly, if I may risque an Irishism, that will be the notice taken of it by the truly learned. The discussion which you would provoke is now quite out of date. To place the laurel crown now, for the first time, on the brows of the ancient learned Greeks and Romans, or their disciples, would be ten times more officious and ridiculous, than to present now, for the first time, the diadem of France to the Emperor Napoleon. Unhappily, for the world, the Emperor Napoleon, like yourself, and Thomas Paine, is defective in point of education. He is not "literis imbutus humanioribus." And though he is now the most conspicuous character in Europe, neither his head nor heart is become susceptible of those just sentiments, which distinguish the enlightened friends of 'humanity and the belles lettres.'—The error, into which you have fallen, has indeed, been anticipated, and its dangers have been clearly ascertained. Knox, when writing 'on the Influence of Politics on the State of Literature, has made an observation which may be applied to *you* with singular force and propriety. "The "newspapers form the whole library of a "politician, the coffee-house is his school, "and he prefers the gazette and an acrimo-"nious pamphlet, for or against the minis-"try, to all that was ever written by a "Homer, or discovered by a Newton."—Again he observes: "he who would add an "elegance to politics, and distinguish his "conversation on the subject, from the "vociferation of porters in an ale-house, "should inspect the finished pieces of an "tiquity; and learn to view public acts and "counsels in the light in which they ap-"peared to those whom the world has long "considered as some of the best and poli-"test teachers of political wisdom.—(Knox's Essays, vol. 2. p. 124.) Now the preservation of the various knowledge, and learning, and wisdom, of ancient Greece and Rome (to recur to the former argument) has entirely depended upon the cultivation and preservation of the respective languages of those countries, in their original purity. And let it be observed, that the still more inestimable treasures of the second scriptures as connected with the history and doctrines of the Christian religion, have owed their existence to the same cause. If it had not been for the successive labours and perseveing industry of scholars in studying and communicating the knowledge of those languages most critically and grammatically, the glorious light, which we have now so much reason to be thankful for, would probably have been for ever concealed from us! Nor shall we have the power of transmitting this purest, and most perfect, and most transcendent revelation of true wisdom to our children, as an authentic document, unimpaired, unless the same studies be still as earnestly inculcated, and as successfully pursued.——ANACHARSIS.——*M. S. Feb. 3, 1807.*

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 6.

SIR,——The unqualified attack, in your number of the 10th instant, on what are generally termed the Learned Languages, has induced me to step forward in their defence; who am neither the immediate subject of your challenge, nor a champion worthy of such a cause. I am a native of the northern division of this island, of which the inhabitants are very variously represented by their southern neighbours; while the late Lord Orford characterises them as "the most ac-"complished nation in Europe, the nation "to which if any country is endowed with "a superior portion of sense he should be "inclined to give the preference in that par-"ticular," by the monks of Oxford and Cambridge (Mr Gibbon's expression) they are treated with the utmost contempt. When an impartial estimate however is formed, Scotland will be found, for a considerable length of time, to have produced men who have distinguished themselves in literature and science, and in active life, in a greater number proportionally than any other part of the British dominions. And this must be in a great measure owing to the prevailing education, of which while the study of the an-

tients forms a part, it by no means engrosses the whole attention, to the exclusion of other branches of knowledge equally necessary to be known, but which are said to be disregarded by the English Universities.—While I admire your spirit, Mr. Cobbett, I cannot help thinking, that your ardour and impetuosity sometimes lead you to form sweeping conclusions, which on a calm survey you would have rejected. This ardour of disposition no man however will blame, when he considers how essential a requisite it is to him who stands forward as the political censor of the age, who, were he to waste his time in weighing circumstances with the scrupulous nicety of a dialectician, would frequently allow the favourable moment of reproof to pass by unappropriated.——Had you confined your strictures to the abuse of the antient languages, I should have heartily given you my assent; it is the wish to degrade them from any place at all in education that I disapprove of.—Your definition of learning is, the possession of knowledge and the power of communicating that knowledge. And with respect to the power of communicating knowledge, a command of words, I know no method equally efficacious with the study of a different language from your own. It unavoidably fixes the attention on the peculiarities that distinguish each of the languages; and the import of the ideas received from a foreign author must be always measured by corresponding expressions in the mother tongue. At the age usually devoted to this exercise the memory is almost the only faculty that is possessed in any degree of perfection; and by no other means could this faculty be rendered more subservient to general improvement. Other acquirements requiring a like degree of understanding may and ought then to be made; but to talk of the higher walks of science or any thing requiring thought and judgment is preposterous in the extreme. Whatever of our own language can be appreciated in early youth and not imparted by these means should also be communicated and can easily be done without interfering in the least with a classical education. You, Mr. Cobbett, although unacquainted it seems with antient learning, are yet what is generally termed a linguist, and I believe you once told us that you taught the English language to foreigners. I appeal then to your experience for what I assert, and I will ask you, whether in the acquisition of the languages you possess you were not conscious, that your knowledge of your own was wonderfully increased, and that many of its niceties were thus forced upon your attention, of which otherwise you would have been conscious? The knowledge that can with most effect be imparted to youth, that accords the best with their dispositions and inclinations, is history, morals and a taste for poetry; and it is very easy to combine this knowledge with the acquisition of languages: nay, it necessarily results from such acquisition.—And what languages shall we choose in preference to the antient for this purpose? Shall we make choice of the poorest of the modern idioms, the language of the French, whose writers are in general as much distinguished for an affectation of manner, as for rash presumptuous conclusions and an almost universal precariousness of principle? Shall we set before them the models of Tuscan eloquence conveying a morality to which that of Covent Garden is comparatively chaste, or unlock the fountains of High Dutch, the most copious and energetic of the modern languages, in some respects superior to the Latin, but profaned by a host of vulgar scribblers?—Let us draw a line of demarcation between the respective merits of the antients and moderns. In history, morals, oratory, and almost every department of poetry the antients are as superior to the moderns as they are inferior in physical science. That education must therefore be the best which places before the student the purest models in every department, that places before him an excellence of which of his own accord he could form no conception. Accordingly, we see the greatest orators have been always those most familiar with the antients for whom they have entertained the highest veneration. Need I point to Cicero, the most conversant of his countrymen in Grecian literature, to Burke, to Johnson, to Buffon, to Montesquieu, Boccace and Wieland. And how rare is it to find in men who have been deprived of a learned education, I do not speak of eloquence, even a tolerable knowledge of composition, notwithstanding of the multitude of readers in every nation of Europe who fall under this description. Independent of the matter of the antient authors, they enjoyed the advantage of composing in languages so happily formed that they could model them to every inflection of meaning; they could give to their construction an energy and a harmony which it is in vain for the moderns to attempt. The latter must always stand at a distance; and we can only admire that they have got over so many difficulties as they have done. But would Burke himself have dared (and after him what other) to bring forth ought that he would place in competition with the Cato Major or the Treatise de Oratore of Cicero?"

Will any historian of the present day stand a comparison with the magnificence of Livy or the energy and sententious gravity of Tacitus? And to the Kuropœdia of Xenophon only the Emile of Rousseau can with effect be opposed. The sensations excited by the perusal of such authors will fade from the mind only with the last glimmer of memory. ——But why should these alone be studied, and the fruit of the experience of the moderns be neglected. In many things the antients were mere children in comparison of the latter. Modern civilization has produced fruits of which it is impossible that they could have formed any conception. It must also be confessed that for the majority of citizens the study of antient literature is worse than useless; it engrosses that time which could for themselves and their country be more beneficially employed in the acquisition of knowledge fitted for the humble walks of ordinary life; and for these acquisitions before a sufficient time is afforded they are hurried by urgent necessity on the busy theatre of the world.—But can he call himself learned, or boast of the universality of his grasp of mind who is ignorant of the manners, customs, and modes of thinking of nations so differently constituted from us as were the Greeks and Romans; who acted such a grand part on the theatre of the world; and who have left such illustrious memorials behind them? Without possessing their language this knowledge is impossible; no process can effect the decomposition of such an amalgamation as the union of the character of a people, and the language in which it is conveyed; and, when Swift, Addison, and Hume are no longer understood, the name and memory of the English, and their glory will be as a passing dream.—Let a Hoogeven compile two immense quartos on Grecian particles, and let a Dalzell swell a treatise on the single particle *de;* these lucubrations are useful; they smooth the path of the general scholar; they fix doubtful and uncertain points which sometimes lead to important conclusions; and, as Dr. Johnson observes, so limited are our faculties that without we circumscribe our exertions to one province, excellence will probably be denied us. So long as these endless minutiæ are not made a *sine qua non* in general education, and the study of antient literature is confined within due bounds, and is so taught as not to interfere with a knowledge of the other important branches of science, and of the constitutions of modern society; so long may beneficial consequences be expected to result, and the contraction of mind inseparable from partial knowledge and exclusive attachment be avoided.—— Yours, &c.——J. B——K.——*Edinburgh, Jan.* 27, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 7.

SIR,——Ever since I had the good fortune first to cast my eye upon your valuable publication, I have continued your constant reader and admirer. On Wednesday, the day on which your Register arrives in this city, I may say in the language of modern epicures, 'I dine!' This they speak emphatically: it is not meant that they do not get dinner every day, 'they' take dinner no doubt, but when they dine, there is something more than common, something very delicate and nice. So I, to supply the cravings of my literary maw, read something every day; some periodical work or daily publication. The Morning Chronicle, your old friend, against whom I see you have found it necessary to declare war;—a war which I am sure you consider just and necessary, otherwise you would not have undertaken it; and which I am confident you will conduct on principles the most liberal and manly:—him I always continue to read, not because he is at war with you, (for I take it for granted that, as in all other wars, your hostilities are mutual) but because he is a friend to literature, and seems to have as little fellow-feeling, as little sympathy and compassion as yourself for the fallen friends and advocates of the bankrupt system (which some persons style, *no doubt most injuriously*, the Pitt system. That invariable adherence to principles of honour and truth, displayed in every page of your work is, Sir, permit me to say, honourable to yourself, and advantageous to society. Virtue, which in times like those we have lately past, retires confounded and abashed, before the universal prevalence of vice, corruption, and folly, and almost yielding to despair, suspects she's but a name, receives from you new strength and vigour, and fortified with your support returns again, resumes her native dignity, and strikes with terror and dismay the crowd of vile assailants which beset her. And, Mr. Cobbett, if I did not intend before I have finished this letter to give you sufficient proof that I have no design to flatter, I would not venture to tell you how much I admire that unwearied industry and application, that power and capacity of mind, which enables you to treat with such success so many subjects of the highest importance, and deepest research; and that, too, with a force, perspicuity, and neatness of stile almost peculiar to yourself. In reading your paper it has often

occurred to me, has Mr. Cobbett studied the Greek and Latin writers? I surely thought from the simplicity of your style, which in composition I consider a chief beauty, that you could have learnt in no other school; but from your silence on the subject, and sometimes quoting French, but never Latin, I was led to suspect I might be mistaken. However, in your last week's Register, you have completely removed all doubt on this subject. You speak of the words *uti possidetis*, frequently referred to in the late negociation, as a " gallipot phrase, the last relick of monkish mummery, &c." and after several sarcastic sneers at the *learned* and *learned languages*, you conclude with the following most remarkable words, " But to bring this matter to the test, I " hereby invite the *learned* gentlemen of " the two Universities to a discussion upon " the subject. I assert that what they call " the *learned* languages are improperly so " called, and that as a part of general edu- " cation, they are worse than useless."—— Your first word on this subject roused my whole attention, and every new sentence excited new emotions. I fancied I had a ready answer to every objection, I panted for an opportunity of repelling, face to face, what I considered an outrageous attack. This was impossible. But I might write to you,— that would not do, as I had never in my life written a line for the press; and as a bad advocate injures a good cause, I was afraid, and still fear, that by an awkward use of the best weapons, I may suffer you to pass unhurt, and leave you to triumph in fancied victory, when, if wielded by a more skilful hand, you must inevitably receive a mortal wound. And are you, Mr. Cobbett, really serious in giving this challenge? Alas, for your fame, my Dear Sir, I am sorry to inform you you will have but half the praise, for unfortunately for you, Mr. Paine is before you in the proposal to abolish the use of the dead languages. Consequently, you must be content with that share of praise you will be entitled to, in effecting by zeal and industry, what he had the ingenuity to suggest; but which I dare say, until he heard of your intention, he is almost in despair of accomplishing, as he is that of his other *ingenious plan* the abolition of Christianity.——But, to be serious, if possible, what could induce you so ostentatiously to repeat what had been treated with such universal silence and contempt when formerly proposed by Paine? Could you really have interpreted that smile of scorn and derision, which was exhibited on the countenance of all the learned as a proof only of their ignorance, a proof that they had so far mispent their time in studying dead languages, that they were not sufficiently masters of any living one, not even of their mother tongue, as to be able to give a satisfactory reply to Paine's ridiculous assertions? He also had said, that the study of the dead languages was more than useless, was injurious to science and the cultivation of all useful knowledge; he even modestly affirmed that the pretensions of learned men were mere affectation; that they knew little or nothing about Latin, and as for Greek they knew not half so much about it as a Grecian milk maid, and not so much of the idiom as the cow she milked. What answer could be given to Mr. Paine? Why, none. He was content in his ignorance, and so let him remain: he understood not the subject, and was incapable of conviction. As a person who has no musical ear, but who at the same time is unconscious of the defect, laughs at the raptures of a musician, and affirms that all his extasies are mere affectation, notwithstanding most men of sense who suffer this privation, observing the general consent of mankind to be against them, although unconvinced yield with as good a grace as possible, and even affect to enjoy a fine air as much as their neighbours, nod their head and beat time with their feet; and, if I shall succeed in proving, that some men do yet understand Greek and Latin, and that some small advantage may be derived from the study of these languages, I shall be entitled to recommend the same prudent seeming to those who are not masters of them; especially, Sir, as you can assure them that " the stupidest wretch on earth " can learn enough for that purpose in a few " hours." But, suppose one of these literati had sat down to reply to Paine; how would he have proceeded? Why, surely the most natural way to prove a man's abilities is to let him speak for himself; so to prove that the Greek and Roman orators had never been too much extolled by their warmest admirers, that they never can be sufficiently admired as patterns of whatever is most beautiful and ingenious, most simple and natural, most sublime and dignified in composition and eloquence, he would have quoted in their own words, some passage in these different species of writing, which I have no doubt would be sufficient to convince the most obstinate, provided always, that they understood it; but, alas, this would be, to use a coarse phrase, ' singing psalms to a dead horse:' which, however, brings to my recollection, by a concatination of ideas, a little story to my purpose, related by Locke, in his Essay on Human Understanding: in endeavouring to

satisfy himself and prove to the world that we have no innate ideas, and that all our impressions are received through the medium of the senses, he took a blind man, a man born blind, and tried, with all the force of his ingenious mind, to give him an idea of *scarlet:* so after much pains, many arguments and examples, the blind man exclaimed in a rapture, "O! I understand it now, "it is just like the *sound of a trumpet.*" So, in this case, arguments are useless; the weapons of the learned are much too fine, and I know of none but that of ridicule, which he himself, in this instance, uses, both for shield and spear, that can be used with effect against such an antagonist as Paine. But, Mr. Cobbett, I do not mean that you should receive no other reply. I am, indeed, very far from thinking that you are a fit person to be laughed at. That you are able to adduce several arguments which would seem more than plausible to most mere English readers; that you are even persuaded that the English language is now fully sufficient for communicating every thought of the human mind—which, by the by, you have already by your writings more forcibly demonstrated than youcould have done by argument,—is what I fully believe: that true genius needs but little instruction, that it even spurns at every plan of education, as trammels more calculated to restrain its exertion than promote its advancement; it learns no catechisms, minds no rules, but observes with an intentive glance, whatever is true or valuable in the labours of others, and appropriates them to her own use. So, although you, Sir, perhaps, are but little indebted to a regular education for whatever you havelearnt; yet, in composition, you will not deny that the study of Addison, Pope, Johnson, Junius, Hume, Robertson, Blair, and the innumerable list of fine writers on poetry and prose, who have improved and adorned the English tongue, has been somewhat conducive to your improvement in literature; and if fortune had decreed that you should have to maintain the honour of your native country, (as you did in America,) in France, or any other country, speaking a different language, with what eagerness would you seize every passage of those writers which you found to your purpose; you would place them in the front of your page in their original form; for I know your mind would revolt at the idea of torturing them by translation; they would, in such warfare, form your advanced guard, your body of reserve, and with such auxiliaries no Frenchman would be a match for you; but, to make the case parallel, give me leave to suppose that this people had been taught exclusively, by these writers, that whatever was beautiful in their language, or mode of composition, were entirely derived from this source, what, in such circumstances, would you think if some of those ready made scholars inflated with a little learning, and a little learning you know is a dangerous thing, should set up for themselves, commence a new plan of education, study no language, but their own, despise their old masters and swear the language of their teachers was mere jargon and ought to be abolished; what would be your indignation, what your contempt! I smile to think what a lashing you would give them; but, perhaps, you will say the case is not applicable; it is perfectly so if I am understood, but lest I should render more obscure by a defective illustration, a subject already sufficiently obvious, I drop the allusion and return to my theme. Is the Greek and Latin a barbarous jargon? ye, illustrous shades, of those revered names to which I have just alluded, what apology shall I make to you, who living devoted all your time and talents to the study of those ancient worthies, whom you reverenced with such enthusiasm and whom you always owned to be the masters from whom you had learnt whatever most had made you the admiration and delight of your countrymen! How silly, how superfluous, seems the attempt to prove that Homer and Virgil, Demosthenes and Cicero, Herodotus and Livy, Xenophon and Cesar, and the numerous list of most admirable writers in both languages, by whom ye have been instructed, were neither barbarians nor wrote in a barbarous language. But, perhaps, I fight my own shadow, it is only the language of Quacks you condemn, 'the gallipot phrases, the monkish mummery'.—No, Mr. Cobbett, I know you are too candid to attempt to escape by an equivocation. You have completely committed yourself. You say, besides the many epithets expressive of the most sovereign contempt for learning and learned men, "what are called the learned languages, are falsely so called." Our own language indeed, not many years ago, might with little injustice be called a barbarous lingo. It was then incapable of any thing in dignified composition either in history or poetry: not so much, indeed, on account of a deficiency of words as chiefly on account of the want of all construction, order, and grammar. The learned Buchanan wrote his history and many most elegant and classical poems in Latin, solely because the English language was literally too barbarous for his purpose; and most of our books of that time, however

ingenious the author, are written in a style so uncouth, so unpolished, that no person possessing any taste for harmony or order, or who has the least musical ear, can have patience to read more than a page of them at a time, and most of our translations from the ancients are also so coarse and disgusting, so full of vulgar and obsolete expressions, that I may safely aver they are as much shut up from the generality of readers of the present day, as if they remained in their original form; and as the greater part of them were done above a century ago; for since the improvement of our language, so far as to be a suitable vehicle for conveying the refined sentiments of so polished a people as the ancients, there has been but little encouragement for men of sufficient literary endowments, to undertake the drudgery of translation, and to this principally may be attributed that general disregard and even contempt of every thing regarding the ancients. To form some idea of this, let any one compare with these the translation lately made of Sallust by Dr. Stewart. He will there see at once the great improvement of the English language, and will form some notion of the merit of the ancients while he perceives the great injustice done them by most former translators, and I may add the very best translations of the poets give but a very imperfect idea of the original. Even Dryden and Pope have entirely buried their authors under a multiplicity of high sounding words. They have covered the natural symetry, beauty, and harmony, by such a profusion of tinsel ornaments, flowers, and furbelows, that the simplicity of the original which is their distinguishing beauty is entirely lost: for I may say in the words of a very successful imitator of Virgil, " beauty needs not the foreign aid of ornament; but is, when unadorn'd, adorn'd the most:" and then there is such an offensive gingle in the rhyme continually recurring on the ear at the end of every line, that one is sure to be either sick or asleep before he has got through a couple of pages. Besides the idiom of the Greek and Latin is so different from that of the English, that it requires a language not less perfect than themselves to do them justice. Our Bible, however, is allowed to be a good translation and not liable to these objections; which is owing chiefly to its being translated from a language infinitely more congenial in its idiom to our own, being analagous and natural in its construction: the Greek and Latin being more artificial and transpositive. Whilst at the same time much praise is due to the *learned men* who translated it. Refer to the names I have just mentioned and say where, at what school they studied. Did they despise the ancients? Milton, although no doubt as sublime a poet as any country can boast, was, notwithstanding his genius, much indebted to his familiar acquaintance with the ancient writers. In fact, any person the least acquainted with both may see at one glance that he had thoroughly imbibed their spirit and manner. His ideas, his measure, construction, and as far as it is possible, his language, greatly resemble those of his masters; and in a few years hence you may compare his " On a sudden open fly with impetuous recoil and jarring sound, the infernal doors, and on their hinges grate harsh thunder."—with Virgil, Book VI. line 574, " *Tum demum horrisono stridentes cardine sacræ panduntur portæ,*"—and you will perceive a resemblance too exact to be the effect of chance. A few more arguments occur, which if I had sufficient space and could borrow your pen for half an hour, should appear most forcible and convincing; but I trust I shall, however deficient, receive every indulgence from you, sir, when you recollect with what difficulty you wrote your first essay in America, in reply to that Frenchman, to whom the English nation is so much obliged, in comparison to the little trouble you now feel in committing your thoughts to writing. The difference between you and I, Mr. Cobbett, is this, you say the Latin and Greek is a barbarous jargon, or at least your words seem fully to import this, and if you ever deny it after what you have said, I shall certainly take it as a confession that you are worsted in the argument. Although I cannot believe that if you should feel this to be the case, that you will not be as good as your promise,—fairly to own it, and ask pardon of the learned gentlemen of both Universities; I say, Sir, our difference seems to be, that you understand the Latin and Greek to be the " last relick of monkish mummery:" I say, and I am almost ashamed seriously to say in the nineteenth century, that they are the languages of the most refined, most civilised, and accomplished nations, as far as we know from history, that ever existed; that we ourselves are the barbarians, who have been taught whatever we know by these very people; that whatever refinement, power, or capacity the English language can boast, is entirely owing to our imitation of that people; almost all our knowledge of science, all our scientific and technical terms, are borrowed exclusively from them. Turn up any English Dictionary and look at almost any word expressing an idea, the smallest degree above the hunting or pastoral life, and you will find it derived either from the

Greek or Latin. Such being the case, can the study of these languages ever be an unnecessary part of an Englishman's education? No, it is impossible. Nothing less than such a revolution as would destroy the laws and constitution of the country, can ever, in my opinion, induce us to abandon the study of the Latin and Greek languages. They are intimately connected, not only with the laws and constitution; but also with the religion of the country. What are called the learned professions, which, however some men may effect to scoff at as useless, but which I have no doubt are indispensibly necessary in the present state of society, are in fact the bonds of its union; these cannot exist for a moment without the knowledge of these languages. They are necessary to the divine for the reasons I have already mentioned: viz. the imperfection and inadequacy of the English language for at least 1600 years, from the æra of our religion, during which time there was no access to any perfect knowledge of christianity, but through the medium of the Greek and Latin. And this in my opinion must have been the case, independent of the bigotry of the Popish clergy. The gospels themselves, and writings of the apostles were originally in Greek; and the Romans and those who afterwards studied their language, were the only people who knew, or who were capable of knowing Greek, the other languages being, in every sense, too barbarous to have any union, sympathy, or resemblance with it so as to enable them either to understand or interpret it. Therefore, the only access to a knowledge of Greek was through the medium of the Latin; all Dictionaries or Lexicons, interpretations, notes, and commentaries being too in Latin. So, in order to hear the glad tidings of the gospel uncontaminated by the absurdities and fictions of ignorant enthusiasts, it was absolutely necessary at least to know Latin. Latin, therefore, became the common medium of intercourse, not only amongst all those who studied the gospel, but also upon every subject of literature; so, Latin being so long established as the language of learning, it will not be difficult to prove that a knowledge of Latin is even at the present time necessary to a student of divinity; although I shall not insist that it is absolutely as much so as formerly. Yet, every person the least acquainted with more languages than one, and, I think you said you had learned French "because it was the language of the military art," knows that notwithstanding the very close resemblance and affinity between the English and French, both in idiom and words, that it is often impossible justly to convey in the one, some ideas perhaps most happily expressed in the other; much more so is it difficult to transfuse the true spirit of a Greek or Latin author into ours, or any modern tongue, so remarkably different as I have already shown, as they are in genius and construction, and in this difference we discover one of the chief sources of the various interpretations, opinions, and disputes, which have arisen upon innumerable passages of scripture; and that many judicious persons thought the true spirit of certain passages of scripture is not given by the common translation is evident, from the labour that Dr. Campbell and others have taken to make a new and correct translation of the gospels and other parts of scripture; from all which I think it is necessary to infer, that before any person can justly claim a pre-eminence in learning, before he can be intitled to the privilege of explaining what may be obscure, and interpreting what is difficult in our translation of the gospels, he ought to know something of the original, so I conclude, that a knowledge of what is called the "learned languages" is necessary to a divine. And to prove that a physician must know Greek and Latin, when every term of their art is either in the one or the other of these languages, and when it is known that the very father of the profession wrote in the former of these languages, is, I think, quite superfluous. And with respect to the lawyer, you, Sir, I presume, will require no other proof than a bare reference to Blackstone, with whom I know you are perfectly familiar, and whom I dare say you sufficiently admire. They both inforce, in the strongest language, the necessity of applying incessantly to the study of the classicks, as the only true model of eloquence and perfect poetry. They allow there are not a few good English authors fit enough patterns of writing, but whatever excellence they possess they seem to think is derived principally from that source; and as it is better to drink the liquor pure and unadulterated at the fountain head, than after it has flowed to a distance, and probably contaminated by impure mixtures, Dr. Beattie also, in his letters lately published by Sir Wm. Forbes, exhorts his pupil Cameron to study the classicks day and night, until he was completely master of them if he ever expected to arrive at any excellence in either eloquence or poetry. And since writing the above, A Treatise on the Utility of Classical Learning, by the same Dr. Beattie, has been put into my hands, to which I am very happy to be able to refer you, as most complete and satisfactory, and to which reference alone I should have confined my communication if I had seen it a

few days sooner. And, now, why should I multiply examples? Does not every eminent English writer, with the sole exception of Mr. Cobbett, acknowledge most explicitly that they have learnt in that school alone? You well know the great esteem which Goldsmith and Addison had for the Greek and Roman classicks. For what purpose did they travel into France and Italy? Not surely to learn to dress, dance, and make a bow. No, it was to see and admire the wonderful remains of the most noble productions of human art, left by the most accomplished people that ever lived; to see that country which gave birth to the most harmonious poet that ever sung, breathe the same air, solicit the same muse, and haply to catch a portion of his inspirations. Are we, then, like ungrateful children, who forgetting what their parents have done for them, insensible to the advantages of a good example, early instruction, or a useful trade which enables them to live in ease and affluence, who notwithstanding leave their parents to languish in penury and wretchedness; are we just let loose from school to neglect our teachers, and fancy in our ignorance that we are wiser than they? Those of their pupils who have made the most progress, and who I have taken the liberty of supposing have been not only your master but that of every English scholar of the present day were not so ungrateful. Had you asserted merely, that valuable as the ancient languages are to every literary character, yet too much time was spent in learning them, I should not, perhaps, have been inclined to contradict you; and whether a wrong plan of education be in use is not my business at present to inquire: but, it cannot be denied, that not one in a hundred who go through the long course of discipline ever know any thing of Latin or Greek. Yet coxcombs who remain in this ignorance, do notwithstanding vapour with hacknied schoolboy sentences, which they either do not understand, or which at most is all they understand, and that very much to the offence of men of plain sense who have never studied any other language than their mother tongue, but who think it hard to be browbeat by men so very much their inferiors, by the constant use of these gallipot phrases or legerdemain lingo. But, Mr. Cobbett, the abuse of a thing is no argument against its utility; and is it fair to conclude, because many fail, that none succeed? How many, I ask you, arrive at any thing respectable in English literature? Will a man learn what he has no taste or genius for? I know you yourself pretty frequently hear Greek and Latin quoted in the House of Commons, by a few members who have not only had an opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of the classicks, but who also, I have no doubt, are familiarly acquainted with them; a mortification which I know of but one way to save you from; of which I shall inform you immediately. However, I cannot avoid commending the attachment which you appear to have for your native language, and the zeal you manifest on all occasions to prevent its being corrupted by foreign idioms; but, surely, no apprehension can be entertained that it will receive any injury from the study of Latin or Greek. Yet many persons, no less zealous for the honour of the English language, but who see notwithstanding the impossibility of making it the general language of Europe, think, and I believe very justly, that as there must be some common medium for diplomatic intercourse, and also to prevent the further extension of French influence which is too much promoted by the general prevalence of their language, it were well if a more general use of Latin than has hitherto been a practice were adopted for that purpose.—I beg leave just to add, the great Cato for many years of his life opposed with equal rigour every foreign innovation, he reprobated in the strongest terms not only the manners but also the language of the Greeks, yet he was compelled to acknowledge the great advantage which men of infinitely less genius seemed to enjoy from their knowledge of the language of that people; so in order to improve that eloquence by which he intended to prevent its introduction, he himself in his grand climacteric sat down to study Greek, of which he soon became a great proficient, and, what was less to be expected a most enthusiastic admirer; and, Mr. Cobbett, if you will like Cato immediately begin the study of the Latin, appropriating an hour every day without intermission, or, if you please, excepting Sunday both for religion and relaxation, only for the short space of two years, and one year more of the same constant application to the Greek, you will then, like Cato, be able to fight the *soi-disant* learned with weapons of their own fashion, but of far superior ease and temper.—— Yours, &c.——AN AMATEUR.—*Aberdeen, Jan.* 20, 1807.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges-street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.